

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1946

bulletin

No. 388

1946





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XV, No. 380 . PUBLICATION 2639

October 13, 1946

Contributors

Leon Goldenberg, co-author of the article on the Polish naturalization law, is Chief of the Northern and Western European Section of the Division for Europe in the Office of European Affairs, Department of State. Mr. Goldenberg was formerly Chief of the Eastern European Economic Section of the former Office of Research and Intelligence. Laure Metzger was connected with the Europe, Near East, and Africa Intelligence Division in the former Office of Research and Intelligence, Department of State.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION:

52 issues, \$3.50; single copy, 10 cents
Special offer: 13 weeks for \$1.00
(renewable only on yearly basis)

Published with the approval of the
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest is included.

Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

THE POLISH NATIONALIZATION LAW

by Leon Goldenberg
and Laure Metzger

The Polish Nationalization Law is far reaching in scope, and its provisions are such that practically every enterprise of importance falls under the law. This article discusses the general features of the law and the general principles of compensation to property holders, and comments on the foreign investments in pre-war Poland. Of particular interest is the attitude of the Polish Government toward the compensation of American investments in Poland.

A. General Features

Early this year the Polish Government undertook the first important step in its over-all economic planning program. On January 3, 1946 the Polish Provisional Parliament passed a law nationalizing Poland's key industries.¹ According to the official election returns in the referendum of July 7, 1946, the nationalization law was sustained by the electorate.

The Polish Nationalization Law is far-reaching in scope, and its provisions are such that practically every enterprise of importance falls under the Law. It consists first of all of a punitive measure for the nationalization—without compensation—of all enterprises owned by the German Reich and by German citizens (art. II). This clause is confiscatory in character, and differs thereby from the remainder of the legislation. Other industrial enterprises are subject to nationalization with compensation if they fulfil one of two conditions: (a) if they fall into the category

of basic industries; or (b) if they are capable of employing more than 50 workers per shift.

Article III of the Nationalization Law enumerates 17 types of "basic industries": mines; natural- and synthetic-oil industries; pipe lines, refineries, and processing works; electric power and gas production and distribution; public waterworks; iron and light-metal foundries; factories producing arms, explosives, and airplanes; cokeries; sugar mills; alcohol distilleries and factories; breweries with an annual capacity over 15,000 hectoliters; edible-oil refineries with over 500 tons annual capacity; yeast factories; flour mills over 15 tons daily capacity; cold storage plants; large and medium-sized textile industries; and printing establishments. Several exceptions specifically modify the provisions of Article III:

(a) The building trades are excluded from nationalization, regardless of the size of the enterprise.

¹ Polish Law of Jan. 3, 1946 Regarding the Nationalization of the Basic Branches of the National Economy.

(b) The Government is authorized to raise the exemption limit for enterprises employing more than 50 employees per shift in industries of a purely seasonal character.

(c) Any existing individual enterprise not falling into the category of either a basic industry or an enterprise employing over 50 workers per shift may be nationalized on the recommendation of the competent minister if it "holds a production monopoly in an important branch of the national economy". The law specifies that this provision may be used as a basis for the nationalization of banking establishments, special storage facilities, and transshipment installations connected with ports and railroads. On the other hand, the Government, at the recommendation of the competent minister, may exempt individual undertakings from the provisions of the nationalization law.

(d) Administrative decisions implementing Article III of the nationalization law may be taken only until December 1, 1946.

(e) Decisions concerning the nationalization of individual enterprises are left to the discretion of the minister under whose jurisdiction a particular business belongs.

(f) The formation of new enterprises in the fields of industry, which are subject to nationalization because of their basic character, will require a license issued by the competent minister and the Central Planning Office.

Articles V and VI of the Nationalization Law deal with the rights and obligations of the state and with the transfer procedure for transferring enterprises to the state. Although the state will acquire all the assets and other rights of nationalized enterprises, it will be free of all the charges and obligations of such enterprises, except for those of a "public-legal"¹ nature.

On April 1, 1946 a decree was issued by the Polish Council of Ministers concerning the procedure governing nationalization of enterprises. The most important paragraphs of the decree have been summarized in a note received from the Polish Embassy in Washington on April 30, 1946. According to this note, "these regulations guar-

antee the owners of enterprises which are sought to be taken over by the State an opportunity to assert their right in proceedings before the appropriate Regional Nationalization Boards and before the appellate organ which is the Chief Commission for Nationalization attached to the Central Planning Office". The Polish note further stated that the agencies in charge of executing the decree are required to publish a list of enterprises to be taken over by the state.

Although the expressed intent of the note is to allow sufficient time for filing exceptions by any owner concerned, a period of only 30 days from the date of official publication of a list of properties is allowed for owners to protest the nationalization of a firm without compensation under Article II and to register a claim for transferring the firm to a list under Article III for nationalization with compensation. When a list is not issued for several days after its official publication date, the time permitted for filing protests is reduced correspondingly. The owners are entitled to call witnesses and experts in the proceedings before a Regional Nationalization Committee. The owners concerned may appeal decisions of the regional commissioners to the General Nationalization Board within 14 days from the date of publication of such decision in the official journal. Proceedings before the General Board shall be public, and notice of sessions shall be given by publication in the *Monitor Polski*.

Owners affected by the nationalization act may appoint proxies and attorneys to protect their rights in proceedings before a Regional Commission. Proceedings with regard to compensation provided for in executive regulations to the law of January 3 may be instituted only after it has been determined whether a particular enterprise is subject to the provisions of the act and whether as such it has been formally taken over by the state.

Another article stipulates the drawing up of a "transfer protocol" in which the owner of the enterprise can participate and include his comments. These protocols are to include an accurate description of the enterprise, a list of all the component parts of the total assets of the enterprise, and a description of the equipment. It was also stated that owners of the component parts would receive compensation on the same principles as creditors of the enterprise and could participate in

¹ The term *public-legal* is from the official English translation prepared by the Polish Government. As there is no further definition of the term, the exact nature of the obligations referred to cannot be determined on the basis of present information.

the drawing up of the transfer protocol. Furthermore, owners of the enterprises to be nationalized are to take up residence on Polish territory or appoint an attorney for receipt of official documents.

B. Compensation Features

Article VII of the Nationalization Law outlines the principles of compensation to property holders:

"(1) The owner of an undertaking taken over by the State (Article III) will receive compensation from the State Treasury within one year from the day of his receipt of notification as to the legally established amount of compensation due him.

"(2) This compensation will in principle be paid in securities, and in exceptional, economically justified cases, may be paid in cash or in other values.

"(3) The amount of compensation due will be established by special commissions. The interested parties will have the right to appear before these commissions. In the event of necessity and in any case at the request of interested parties, the commission will call competent experts.

"(4) An order of the Council of Ministers will determine the constitution of the commission, the manner of appointment of its members, the number of members constituting a quorum, the mode of procedure of the commission, and the procedure for appeals against its decisions.

"(5) When establishing the compensation to be paid, the following factors should be taken into consideration:

(a) The general decrease of the value of the national assets.

(b) The net value of the assets of the enterprise on the day of its nationalization.

(c) The reduction in the value of the enterprise as a result of war losses and losses sustained by the enterprise as the result of war and occupation from September 1, 1939 to the moment of its nationalization.¹

(d) The amount of investment after September 1, 1939.

(e) The special circumstances affecting the value of the enterprise (the period of duration of concessions, licenses, etc.)

"An order of the Council of Ministers will determine in detail the basis of calculating compen-

sation, (section (2)) as well as the method of amortizing the securities."²

As may be seen from the text of Article VII, the provisions for compensation are subject to broad administrative interpretation.

Hilary Minc, the Polish Minister of Industry, when discussing compensation for nationalized property, emphasized that the Government had adopted the principle of compensation "although it burdens the whole state and delays reconstruction". He added, however, "I think I represent the whole nation when I say that just compensation should be paid to such an extent, in such form, conditions, and terms, that it would not handicap the development of our economy."³

Since the procedures for transferring enterprises to the state are dealt with only in the broadest terms (art. VI) the compensation problems may be further complicated by administrative decisions. The attitude of the Polish Government on the compensation of American investors is revealed in the note of the Polish Embassy dated April 30, 1946, which stated:

"The Polish Government wishes to stress the close relationship existing between the time when it will be possible to pay effective compensation to citizens of the United States and the time required for the reconstruction of Poland's war ravaged economy. In order to achieve the objectives sought in the note of January 17, 1946—that compensation to citizens of the United States be effected in a manner which would permit an exchange of the amounts paid for dollars in the shortest possible time⁴—the dollar reserves of Poland must first be substantially increased through the development of exports which in turn is contingent on the expansion of the country's production. The Polish Government expresses its hope that the stabilization of the world's economy will make it possible for large-scale financial as-

¹ A separate claim for war damage can be filed. It was reported that the War Reparations Bureau, attached to the Council of Ministers, is accepting such claims for registration and statistical purposes from Polish citizens as well as from foreigners. Submission of the claim does not, however, mean that payment of the damages may be expected in the near future.

² Polish Law of Jan. 3, 1946 Regarding the Nationalization of the Basic Branches of the National Economy (art. VII).

³ Warsaw Radio, Jan. 2, 1946.

sistance to be made available to Poland in order that the reconstruction program may be accelerated and thus permit Poland to make compensation payments of the kind referred to in the note of January 17, 1946, sooner than would otherwise be the case.

"In view of the difficulties explained in the above paragraph and the further difficulty of making final appraisal of any specific property involved in terms of a transferable foreign currency, the Polish Government feels compelled to point out that it would appear to be premature at this present moment to undertake final determinations of individual cases. The Polish Government wishes, however, to express its readiness to begin general discussions with the Government of the United States on compensation to any American citizen for enterprises taken over by the Polish State."

Thus the note suggests a willingness in principle to pay compensation in dollars. It further suggests that the Polish Government is particularly interested at this time both in avoiding specific

¹The significant distinction under Polish law between limited liability companies and joint-stock companies relates to the negotiability of securities.

²Concise National Yearbook of Poland, September 1939-June 1941. Available.

Nationalization of Polish Industries

[Released to the press October 5]

The Polish Government released on September 30, 1946 a list of 513 firms in Poland which are to be nationalized without compensation to the owners and another list of 404 firms for which the Polish Government proposes to compensate the owners. Since American interests may be involved, both lists are being forwarded to the Department by the United States Embassy in Warsaw and will be published as soon as they are received.

The firms designated for nationalization without compensation were stated by the Polish Ministry of Industry to have been owned by the German Government or by German citizens. Included among these there may be firms in which United States nationals own an interest and in which the alleged German ownership was acquired without the consent of the owners subsequent to the German invasion of Poland. In some cases it is understood that the owners were denied access to their property and records after the seizure by the Germans.

commitments and in keeping the negotiations alive. It also intimates that there will be a relationship between the amount of "financial assistance" made available to Poland and the payment of adequate compensation to interested Americans.

Note on Foreign Investments in Pre-War Poland

Foreign investments played an important part in building up Poland's pre-war industries. In 1937, out of a total of 1,066 active joint-stock companies, 391 had foreign participation with foreign capital amounting to 1,294,300,000 zlotys (\$244,600,000), or 40.1 percent of their total capital. Foreign investments were primarily concentrated in the mining and petroleum industries and, to a lesser extent, in the textile, chemical, public utility, communication, and transportation industries. Foreign participation was also prominent in limited liability companies¹ and in business partnerships. Although out of a total of 3,590 limited liability companies only 403 had foreign shareholders and although foreign interests were represented in only 999 of a total of 17,085 partnerships, the percentage of foreign capital invested was considerable, representing 103,800,000 zlotys (\$19,600,000) or 32.7 percent of the total capital owned by limited liability companies and partnerships.²

According to an order of the Polish Council of Ministers, dated April 1, 1946, only 30 days from the date of publication of these lists in Poland is allowed for entering protests against nationalization with or without compensation with the appropriate Polish Provincial or Central Committees. The effective date of publication of these lists was September 23, 1946, although they were not released to the public until September 30, 1946. While the United States Government is endeavoring to obtain an extension of time in order to permit proper protection of American interests, American claimants are urged to enter their protests at the earliest possible date.

The Polish Government requires that owners of nationalized firms have a legal residence or a legal representative in Poland for the receipt of official documents and notices regarding the hearing of their cases. Americans who wish to employ the services of attorneys in Poland may obtain a list of attorneys furnished to the Department of State. The Department, however, can assume no responsibility for the persons named therein.

Soviet Position Concerning Revision of Montreux Convention

The recent note of the Soviet Government, presented to the Turkish Government on September 24, 1946,¹ substantially reiterates the position taken in the Soviet note of August 7, 1946.² The Soviet note, for example, repeats the charges of violations of the Montreux convention during the war. It notes Turkish acceptance as a basis for discussion of the first three principles set forth in the August 7 note concerning commercial freedom of the Straits, opening of the Straits to the warships of Black Sea powers, and closure to warships of non-riparian powers "except in cases especially provided for". These principles had been outlined in the American note of November 2, 1945.³

In view of Turkish objections, the Soviet note discussed points 4 and 5 involving the establishment of a regime of the Straits by the Black Sea powers and the setting up of a joint Turco-Soviet system of defense for the Straits, at some length. In the opinion of the Soviet Government, since the Straits led into the assertedly "closed" Black Sea and differed, therefore, from world seaways like Gibraltar or the Suez Canal, it was necessary that a regime of the Straits which would above all meet the special situation and the security of Turkey, the U. S. S. R., and the other Black Sea powers should be established. The note indicated that Turkey had accepted the principle of the elaboration of a regime of the Straits by Turkey and the Black Sea powers in the treaties of Moscow (March 16, 1921) and Kars (October 13, 1921) and in the Turco-Ukrainian agreement of May 21, 1922.

The Soviet note also elaborates on the theme of joint Turco-Soviet defense of the Straits, pointing, among other things, to the passage of the

German cruisers *Goeben* and *Breslau* in August 1914 through the Straits as well as to alleged incidents during World War II. The fact that the Soviet Union has a shoreline of some 1,100 miles along the Black Sea which gives access to important regions of the country is also cited as a reason for direct participation of the Soviet Union in the defense of the Turkish Straits. In the Soviet view, only a joint system of defense could offer genuine security to all parties directly concerned, namely Turkey and the other Black Sea states.

The Soviet Government expressed the view that its position as to joint defense was entirely consonant with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations since the Soviet proposal was intended to serve not only the general interests of international commerce, but to create the conditions for the maintenance of the security of the powers of the Black Sea and to contribute to the consolidation of the general peace.

Finally the Soviet note stated the view of the Soviet Government, in the light of the Potsdam Conference (1945), that the Straits regime should be revised to meet present conditions and that the calling of a conference for this purpose should be preceded by a discussion of the question through direct *pourparlers* between governments.

¹ Not printed.

² BULLETIN of Sept. 1, 1946, p. 420.

³ Not printed. The principles which, in this Government's view, might serve as a basis for a revision of the Montreux convention, were announced by the Secretary of State in a press and radio news conference on November 7 and were published in the BULLETIN of Sept. 11, 1945, p. 766. For article on Montreux Convention of the Straits by Harry N. Howard see BULLETIN of Sept. 8, 1946, p. 435.

THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE

General Principles for a Free International Danube

REMARKS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG¹

The Delegation of the United States has no direct commercial interest in the Danube problem, but we have an emphatic interest in international peace and security and in avoiding international trade barriers which invite discrimination and friction. These factors here involved have a special temporary interest in the Danube because it is an important—and now stagnant—artery of commerce in the American zones of occupation in Germany and Austria. Therefore we feel entitled to urge these general principles for a free international Danube as contained in the U. S. and U. K. proposal.

As regards our temporary interest, it is well known that we want Germany administered as an economic unit pursuant to the unmistakable Potsdam mandate for the benefit of the total German economy. It is historically clear that Danubian commerce cannot prosper if it is at the mercy of various uncoordinated, restrictive, and discriminatory administrations which respond to the local judgments of the eight national jurisdictions through which the Danube flows. Some of the

troublesome current problems on the Danube are the result of thus dividing the Danube in water-tight compartments. So long, therefore, as American occupation continues in Germany and Austria, we are "parties in interest"—although it is a very unselfish interest.

But our basic concern is something else. Here is the longest navigable waterway in Europe west of the Soviet Union. It is important to the commerce of eight riparian states and to the commerce of many other states. It has long involved other significant impacts upon central Europe. As was once said of the Thames, the Danube is "liquid history".

Such a stream is an inevitable factor in the peace of the area it serves; therefore it is a factor in the total and indivisible peace which we are all pledged to sustain.

The Danube River system is of great importance in the exchange of commodities among the nations in the Danube basin and as a means of contact with the outside world. Its significance as an artery of trade is enhanced by the comparative inadequacy of rail and highway facilities in this area. These things are important to all of us, because the restoration of a sound economy is prerequisite to a sound peace. It is impossible to contemplate a prosperous Danube without an over-all assurance of navigation and commerce free from discriminations and arbitrary sectional

¹ Made at the meeting of the Economic Commission for the Balkans and Finland at the Paris Peace Conference on Sept. 30, and released to the press on the same date. Senator Vandenberg is a member of the United States Delegation to the Conference. For article on Danubian transportation problems in relation to development of the Basin, see BULLETIN of June 30, 1946, p. 1108.

barriers. It is equally impossible otherwise to contemplate a peaceful Danube, because it is historically a zone of friction.

These are old truths. They have been recognized by the maintenance of international administration of the Danube in differing degrees since 1856. The Treaty of Versailles internationalized the Danube, for example, from the head of navigation to the sea and established free navigation throughout the river's length with a control commission including other than riparian states as a recognition of the breadth of interest involved.

It is needless to trace the fluctuating fortunes of the various Danubian commissions since 1856. The important point in the American view is that this relative freedom of navigation on the Danube has been accepted in one form or another as essential for 90 years. It is obviously even more essential in this new era when the United Nations are making common cause for peace and progress.

The pending proposal, Mr. President, declares a set of general principles. Navigation shall be free and open on terms of equality to all states. Laws and regulations shall be non-discriminatory. No obstacles to navigation shall be placed in the main channels. No tolls or other charges shall be levied except to defray the costs of development and maintenance, and the latter shall be administered in such a manner as not to discriminate against any state. Equality is guaranteed Rumania in any international regime. In addition to these general principles a conference of all interested states shall meet within six months to establish this regime. Any disagreements will be umpired by the International Court of Justice.

Mr. President, so far as these general principles are concerned, I venture to say that they have been inherent in the Danubian regime in one form or another throughout these 90 years. This is no new concept. It has been acknowledged as the essential formula for peace and progress—no matter how illy implemented—for almost a century. It seems to the American Delegation that it would be a great mistake for us to turn our backs upon all this history and experience. Worse, our silence would be an actual retreat—an abandonment of freedoms long established before we fought World War II for greater freedoms. It seems to us that the world is entitled to know that its peacemakers are at least "holding their own" and not slipping back into darker ages.

We agree that riparian states have a special interest, but all riparian states except enemy states are represented at this table. The others have a right of consultation under this proposal in developing these plans unless we intend to repudiate history and experience which we do not anticipate. It seems to us we should welcome an opportunity in this Rumanian treaty to pledge Rumania to these general principles, particularly in view of the fact that it was Rumania which upset the fairly satisfactory international regime in 1938 by demanding a rendition to herself of the substantive powers of the then existing Danube Commission.

In a word, Mr. President, it seems to the American Delegation that if we intend that the Danube shall resume the freedoms heretofore established and shall develop in peace and progress we must say so now. It is our only chance. We shall not collide with any Danubian aspirations unless these aspirations collide with these freedoms. In such an unexpected event it is doubly necessary that we should anticipate the protective contract now.

For these reasons the United States Delegation has joined with the proposal of the United Kingdom in its present or in any perfected form.

Regarding the draft peace treaty with Rumania, part VII, article 34, Clauses Relating to the Danube, a redraft submitted September 27 by the U. K. and U. S. Delegations of article 34 to supersede the existing U. S. and U. K. drafts reads as follows:

"A. Paragraphs 1 through 6 are exactly the same as in the draft peace treaty with Rumania. There is added one paragraph reading: 'B. A conference consisting of U. S., U. S. S. R., U. K., and France together with the riparian states including Rumania will be convened within a period of six months of the coming into force of the present treaty to establish the new permanent international regime for the Danube'."

Letters of Credence

MINISTER OF RUMANIA

The newly appointed Minister of Rumania, Dr. Mihail Ralea, presented his credentials to the President on October 1. For texts of the Minister's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 690.

International Traffic on the Danube River

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL BY U. S. DELEGATION¹

In view of the critical limitations of shipping facilities on the Danube River which are adversely affecting the economic recovery of southeastern Europe, the Economic and Social Council recommends that a conference of representatives from all interested States be arranged under the auspices of the United Nations, to meet in Vienna not later than 1 November, for the purpose of resolving the basic problems now obstructing the resumption of international Danube traffic and establishing provisional operating and navigation regulations.

Interested States are the riparian states, states in military occupation of riparian zones, and any states whose nationals can demonstrate clear title to Danube vessels which are now located on, or have operated prior to the war, in international Danube traffic.

As a basis for discussion in this projected conference of representatives from interested States,

the Economic and Social Council submits the following recommendations:

(a) that commercial traffic be resumed on the Danube from Regensburg to the Black Sea;

(b) that security from seizure be guaranteed to all ships, their crews, and cargoes;

(c) that all Danube vessels (except German) be allowed to sail under their own national flag;

(d) that adequate operating agreements be arranged between the interested States as well as the national and private shipping companies, under general supervision of the occupying powers to permit the maximum use of the limited shipping facilities;

(e) that information be exchanged freely on condition of navigation and that responsibility be undertaken for river maintenance over the entire length of the river.

Assistance to Food and Agriculture Organization on Longer-Term International Machinery for Dealing With Food Problems

RESOLUTION TO BE PROPOSED BY THE U. S. DELEGATION²

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL,

Sharing with the FAO the basic objective of preventing recurrences of the phenomenon of inadequate food supplies in some parts of the world at times of food surpluses in other parts of the world,

COMMENDS the FAO for taking the initiative in establishing a Preparatory Commission to recommend specific international action toward this end,

APPOINTS as its two representatives on the Preparatory Commission the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission or his deputy and the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee

for the International Conference on Trade and Employment or his deputy,

REQUESTS these representatives to report on the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission to each session of the Council until the Commission completes its work,

REQUESTS the Economic and Employment Commission to keep itself closely informed of the progress of the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission and to advise the Council as to the nature and timing of further measures that may be required in order to assure progress toward the basic objective,

REQUESTS the Secretary-General to provide the Council's representatives on the Preparatory Commission with competent and adequate assistance for the performance of this function and actively to assist the Economic and Employment Commission in carrying out this resolution.

¹ Document E/94/Rev. 1, Agenda item No. 21 of Document E/192, Sept. 29, 1946.

² Item 6 of the agenda relating to Document E/198, Sept. 30, 1946.

**Committee on the Terms of Reference of the Subcommissions
of the Economic and Employment Commission: Proposal
by the Delegation of the United States of America¹**

September 24, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. LIE:

In connection with the current discussions in the Economic and Social Council regarding the establishment of a Sub-Commission on Economic Development under the Economic and Employment Commission, I wish to bring to your attention the importance which the United States Government attaches to the work of the United Nations in this field.

As the Economic and Social Council recognizes, the main international function of promoting industrial and economic development of underdeveloped countries should be centered in the Economic and Social Council. The Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labor Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and, when it shall have come into existence, the International Trade Organization, all have important contributions to make to the promotion of economic development. The co-ordination of these activities is, of course, a responsibility of the Economic and Social Council.

In addition to the work which the Food and Agriculture Organization is initiating in the field of agricultural resources, it seems important to the United States that the following functions be carried out in the field of industrialization and non-agricultural resources:

(a) To investigate problems in the development of industrialization and to make recommendations concerning policies for promotion of such development.

(b) To develop appropriate policies of international co-operation with respect to:

(i) scientific, technological, and economic research relating to industrial production and development;

(ii) the conservation of mineral and other non-agricultural resources and the adoption of improved methods of mineral and industrial production;

(iii) the adoption of improved technical processes to stimulate greater productivity and more effective industrial administration.

(c) To furnish such technical assistance as members of the United Nations may request, within the resources of the United Nations, to aid in the making of surveys of geological and mineral resources, potential markets and opportunities for industrial development in general, and to organize in co-operation with the governments concerned such missions as may be needed to perform these functions.

(d) To collect statistics on present and projected mineral and industrial developments, to conduct studies and inquiries concerning such developments and to analyze their effects upon non-agricultural industries and upon the world economy in general.

(e) To arrange for consultation among members of the United Nations and to consult with members of their development programmes with a view to the co-ordination of such programmes and to promoting international adjustments where necessary.

(f) Upon request, to advise the International Bank on specific industrialization projects and larger development programmes with a view to assisting in the elaboration of financial policies for such developmental purposes.

(g) To conduct studies into the need for, and methods of, the international incorporation of private business firms conducting business operations on an international or world scale.

I am instructed to urge that in the planning of the work of the Secretariat, adequate funds and staff be allocated to enable the Economic and Social Council to perform the functions which are outlined above. I should also appreciate your making copies of this letter available to the Sub-Commission on Economic Development for its consideration when it begins the planning of its work.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. WINANT

His Excellency TRYGVE LIE,
*Secretary-General, United Nations,
Lake Success,
Long Island, New York.*

¹ Economic and Social Council Document E/AC.11/7, Sept. 26, 1946.

Summary Statement by the Secretary-General¹

MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED AND THE STAGE REACHED IN THEIR CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to Rule 11 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, I submit the following Summary Statement of matters of which the Security Council is seized and of the stage reached in their consideration on 20 September 1946.

7. *The Greek Situation*

By letter dated 5 September 1946 addressed to the President of the Council (S/151), the Representative of the People's Republic of Albania to the United Nations requested, under Article 32, that he be invited to present to the Council a statement of facts concerning the application by the Ukrainian S.S.R. This request was considered at the sixty-second and sixty-fourth meetings and nine Representatives voted in favour of inviting the Representative of Albania to make a factual statement, one against and one abstained. The Representative of Albania was, therefore, invited to the Council table and presented his statement. The discussion on the substance of the Ukrainian S.S.R. application was then resumed, and continued at the sixty-fifth and sixty-sixth meetings.

By telegram dated 11 September 1946 (S/158), the Minister of Foreign Affairs, a.i., of the People's Republic of Albania drew the attention of the Council to the situation created on the Greco-Albanian frontier by the continual provocations due to the action of the Greek Soldiers. He stated that the incidents seriously endangered tranquility in the Balkans and requested the Council to use all its influence to put an end to the Greek provocations by availing itself of all the means at its disposal under the Charter of the United Nations.

At the sixty-seventh meeting the Representative of the U.S.S.R. submitted the following resolution:

"THE SECURITY COUNCIL ESTABLISHES THE FACT:
that on the Greco-Albanian border there is of late a constant increase in the number of frontier

incidents provoked by aggressive Greek monarchist elements who are striving by this means to bring about an armed conflict between Greece and Albania for the purpose of detaching Southern Albania for the benefit of Greece,

that the persecution of national minorities in Greece by the Greek Government, by provoking national strife, is straining the relations between Greece and her other neighbours,

that the unbridled propaganda of the aggressive Greek monarchist elements demanding the annexation of territories belonging to these neighbours threatens to complicate the situation in the Balkans, where for the first time as the result of the victory gained by the armed forces of the United Nations, the foundation has been laid for the democratic development of the Balkan countries, and for their close collaboration in the cause of establishing a firm and lasting peace,

that in their policy of aggression the aggressive Greek monarchist elements are striving to exploit the results of the falsified plebiscite held on 1 September under terroristic conditions, in which all the democratic parties of various trends were removed from political life. They are likewise exploiting the presence of British troops on Greek territory, who in spite of the repeated declaration by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain that these troops would be withdrawn after the elections of 31 March 1946, continue to remain even at the present time on the territory of Greece:

that all these circumstances create a situation envisaged by Article 34 of the Charter of the United Nations and endanger peace and security.

For the above-mentioned reasons THE SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLVES to call upon the Greek Government:

Firstly, to take measures in accordance with Article 2, Paragraph 4 of the Charter of the United Nations for the immediate cessation of the provocative activities of the aggressive monarchist elements on the Greco-Albanian frontier;

secondly, to call upon the Greek government to put an end to the agitation regarding the state of war which is said to exist between Greece and Albania, in spite of the fact that Albania is en-

¹ Security Council Document S/164, Sept. 20, 1946.

This summary supplements the one printed in the BULLETIN of Sept. 22, 1946, p. 528; the omitted parts correspond substantially to the material formerly printed.

deavouring to establish normal peaceful relations with Greece;

thirdly, to terminate the persecution of national minorities in Greece, as contrary to Article 1, Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Charter of the United Nations;

fourthly, to retain on the agenda of the Security Council the question of the menacing situation brought about as the result of the activities of the Greek Government so long as the latter fails to carry out the recommendations proposed to it by the Security Council.

The Representative of Australia proposed a resolution

"that the Security Council pass to the next item of business". Discussion on these resolutions and on the substance of the Ukrainian S.S.R. application continued at the sixty-eighth meeting.

At the sixty-ninth meeting the following resolution was proposed by the Representative of the Netherlands:

"THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Having been informed that a number of frontier incidents have taken place on the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria, on the other hand,

INVITES THE SECRETARY-GENERAL to notify the Governments of the said countries on behalf of the Security Council, that the Council, without pronouncing any opinion on the question of responsibility, earnestly hopes that these Governments, each insofar as it is concerned, will do their utmost, inasmuch as that should still be necessary, to stop those regrettable incidents by giving appropriate instructions to their national authorities, and by making sure that these instructions be rigidly enforced."

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

IN SESSION AS OF OCTOBER 6, 1946

Far Eastern Commission.....	Washington.....	February 26
United Nations:		
Security Council.....	Lake Success.....	March 25
Military Staff Committee.....	Lake Success.....	March 25
Commission on Atomic Energy.....	Lake Success.....	June 14
UNRRA Planning Commission for International Refugee Organization.	Washington.....	July 24
Economic and Social Council: Third Session with Commissions and Subcommissions.	Lake Success.....	September 11-October 3
Paris Peace Conference.....	Paris.....	July 29
German External Property Negotiations with Portugal (Safehaven)...	Lisbon.....	September 3
PICAO:		
Interim Council.....	Montreal.....	September 4
Divisional		
U. K. Demonstrations of Radio Aids to Air Navigation.....	London.....	September 9-30
Special		
Conference on North Atlantic Ocean Stations.....	London.....	September 17-24
Regional		
Middle East Regional Air Navigation Meeting.....	Cairo.....	October 1-15
ILO: Twenty-ninth Session of the International Labor Conference...	Montreal.....	September 19-October 9
International Film Festival.....	Cannes.....	September 20-October 5
Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund and Bank: Joint Meeting.	Washington.....	September 27-October 3

¹ Calendar prepared by the Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Five Power Telecommunications Meeting.....	Moscow.....	September 28
Caribbean Tourist Conference.....	New York.....	September 30–October 9
International Tourist Organizations Conference.....	London.....	October 1–7
Second Pan American Congress of Mining Engineering and Geology..	Rio de Janeiro.....	October 1–15
Second Pan American Congress of Physical Education.....	Mexico City.....	October 1–15
SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER–DECEMBER 1946		
Eighteenth International Congress for Housing and Town Planning..	Hastings, England...	October 7–12
PICAO:		
Divisional		
U.S. Demonstrations of Radio Aids to Air Navigation.....	New York–Indianapolis.	October 7–26
Meteorological Division.....	Montreal.....	October 29
Special Radio Technical Division.....	Montreal.....	October 30–November 8
Communications Division.....	Montreal.....	November 19
Search and Rescue Division.....	Montreal.....	November 26
Rules of the Air and Air Traffic Control Practices Division.....	Montreal.....	December 3
Regional		
Air Traffic Control Committee, European-Mediterranean Region..	Paris.....	October 28
Conference on Tin.....	London.....	October 8–12
Preparatory Commission of the International Conference on Trade and Employment: First Meeting.	London.....	October 15
Permanent Committee of the International Health Office.....	Paris.....	October 23
United Nations: General Assembly (Second Part of First Session)...	Flushing Meadows..	October 23
United Maritime Consultative Council: Second Meeting.....	Washington.....	October 24–30
International Commission for Air Navigation (CINA): Twentieth Session.	Dublin.....	October 28–31
FAO: Preparatory Commission to study World Food Board Proposals..	Washington.....	October 28
UNESCO:		
"Month" Exhibition.....	Paris.....	October 28–December 1
General Conference.....	Paris.....	November (Exact date not determined)
World Health Organization: Interim Commission.....	Geneva.....	November 4
International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts (CITEJA)..	Cairo.....	November 6
Inter-American Commission of Women.....	Washington.....	November 11–20
ILO:		
Industrial Committee on Textiles.....	Brussels.....	November 14
Industrial Committee on Building, Engineering and Public Works..	Brussels.....	November 25

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS »**U. S. DEMONSTRATIONS OF RADIO AIDS TO AIR NAVIGATION¹**

Representatives of 62 nations have been invited to observe demonstrations of United States radio aids to air navigation which will be held at New

¹ Prepared by the Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

York and Indianapolis from October 7 to 26, 1946.

The demonstrations were requested by the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (PICAO), which is attempting to standardize the facilities used in international flying.

The War and Navy Departments, the Coast Guard, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and various United States manufacturers will demonstrate some 50 types of the most advanced radio, radar, and television equipment for safe and speedy air operations.

The delegates will convene in Montreal after the demonstrations to discuss a uniform system of radio aids to world air navigation.

CONFERENCE ON TIN¹

The Conference on Tin which is scheduled to meet at London from October 8 to 12, 1946 was called upon the invitation of the Government of the United Kingdom. The main purposes of the Conference are to explore the prospective world tin situation in production and consumption and to consider the possible need of establishing an intergovernmental study group, representative of producing and consuming countries. Both in the *Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment* issued by the United States Government nearly a year ago and in the recently issued *Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization*, it is recognized that burdensome surpluses, or other special difficulties, may arise in connection with the production of particular commodities, and provisions are made for intergovernmental study and action in such situations through the machinery of the proposed International Trade Organization. The Conference on Tin is being called in the light of these provisions.

The countries which have been invited by the United Kingdom to send delegations to the Conference include the principal tin producing and consuming areas. They are Belgium, Bolivia, China, France, the Netherlands, Siam, the United States of America, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The members of the United States Delegation are as follows:

Chairman:

Donald D. Kennedy, Chief, International Resources Division, Department of State

Advisers:

Henry Buckman, Consulting Engineer, Washington, D. C.

H. C. Bugbee, Attaché, American Embassy, London, England

John J. Croston, Deputy Director, Metals and Minerals Division, Civilian Production Administration

Carl Ilgenfritz, Vice President, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Jesse C. Johnson, Deputy Director, Office of Metals Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation

Samuel Lipkowitz, Chief, Minerals Section, International Resources Division, Department of State

Elmer W. Pehrson, Chief, Economics and Statistics Branch, Bureau of Mines, Department of Interior

Stenographer:

Miss Roseann Coulton, Department of State

In the period between the World Wars, there developed various controls over the production and export of tin in the main producing countries, culminating in the establishment and operation of the International Tin Committee. These controls, in which the governments of several producing countries participated, were prompted in large part by the very serious situation in which producers found themselves in the years of the great depression.

During World War II, because of the great importance of tin as a war material and because of the disruption of supplies caused by Japanese action in the great producing areas of the Malayan Peninsula and the East Indian islands, tin was made subject to the closest kind of governmental control in nearly all countries. With continued shortage of supplies resulting from wartime destruction, controls are still maintained, including international allocation by the Combined Tin Committee, upon which there are representatives of the principal producing and consuming nations. At the same time, however, there is promise of gradual recovery of tin production.²

¹ Prepared by the Division of International Resources in collaboration with the Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

² The position of tin in the transition period is described by John W. Barnet in an article in the BULLETIN of Aug. 4, 1946.

Tin is so important a commodity in the economy of several of the producing countries and it is so interesting from the standpoint of the history of production and market controls that the present conference in London is one of more than ordinary interest.

U. S. DELEGATION TO FIRST MEETING OF PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

[Released to the press October 4]

Acting Secretary Acheson announced on October 4 that the President has approved the composition of the United States Delegation to the First Meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on Trade and Employment. This meeting will be held at London, October 15, 1946, under the auspices of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

When the Economic and Social Council, on February 18, 1946, approved a resolution calling for an International Conference on Trade and Employment, it also constituted a Preparatory Committee of 19 nations: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Chile, China, Cuba, France, India, Lebanon, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States. This Committee was asked to elaborate an annotated draft agenda including a draft convention for consideration by the Conference. The Council further suggested that the Preparatory Committee, in developing the agenda for the Conference, include the following topics:

(a) International agreement relating to the achievement and maintenance of high and stable levels of employment and economic activity.

(b) International agreement relating to regulations, restrictions, and discrimination affecting international trade.

(c) International agreement relating to restrictive business practices.

(d) International agreement relating to inter-governmental commodity arrangements.

(e) Establishment of an International Trade

¹ Prepared by the Division of International Conferences, Department of State, in collaboration with the U. S. Public Health Service.

Organization as a specialized agency of the United Nations having responsibilities in the fields of (b), (c), and (d) above.

In preparing for this and subsequent meetings United States experts have prepared and submitted to the nations of the world the *Proposal for Expansion of World Trade and Employment* and more recently a *Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization of the United Nations*.

The members of the United States Delegation are as follows:

Chairman: Clair Wilcox, Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State;

Vice Chairman: Harry C. Hawkins, Economic Counselor, American Embassy, London;

Delegates: Lynn R. Edminster, Vice Chairman, United States Tariff Commission; John W. Gunter, Treasury Representative, American Embassy, London; John H. G. Pierson, Consultant on Employment Policy, Department of Labor; Robert B. Schwenger, Chief, Division of International Economic Studies, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture; Frank Shields, Chief of Commercial Policy Staff, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce;

Advisers: Willis Armstrong, Adviser on State Trading, Department of State; Edmund Kellogg, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State; Donald D. Kennedy, Chief, International Resources Division, Department of State; John M. Leddy, Adviser on Commercial Policy, Department of State; Robert P. Terrill, Associate Chief, International Resources Division, Department of State;

Technical Secretary: J. Robert Schaetzel, Special Assistant to the Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State;

Secretary: Basil Capella, Division of International Conferences, Department of State;

Stenographers: Mrs. Mary Balsinger, Miss Roseann Coulton, and Miss Dorothy Weissbrod, Department of State.

THE SECOND PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON LEPROSY¹

The Second Pan American Conference on Leprosy is scheduled to meet at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, October 19-31, 1946. The 21 American republics and the Pan American Sanitary Bureau have been invited by the Government of Brazil to send official delegates, while the International Leprosy Association, the American Leprosy Foundation

(Continued on page 677)

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

U. S. Aims and Policies in Europe

BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE¹

I am not in Paris today by accident. While in Moscow last December when the question of place of the Peace Conference arose I at once thought of Paris and France.

I telephoned to Mr. Bidault suggesting that if the French Government would invite the conference to meet in Paris I felt confident the invitation would be accepted. The invitation was extended and unanimously accepted.

Mr. Bidault and his associates and the people of Paris have left undone nothing that would contribute to our work and our comfort. The longer we stay—and we have been in no hurry to leave—the more the French people have made us feel at home. They not only want to be hospitable but they have the know-how.

Because of the many duties devolving on Mr. Bidault, I am amazed at his ability to find time to show such interest in the work of the Conference. He is a man of great intelligence, charm, and industry. And this intelligence, charm, and industry he always uses to promote the welfare of the country he serves and loves so well.

In this company I will not speak of the long and firm friendship which has existed between the people of France and the people of the United States—a friendship which existed before we attained our independence. That friendship runs so deep that we do not have to talk about it. Differ as we may from time to time, our two peoples always have stood and always will stand together in time of crisis. Liberty, equality, fraternity—the rights of man—are our common heritage.

Twice in my generation the soldiers of France and the soldiers of America have fought side by side in defense of their common heritage of freedom.

America is proud of her contribution to our common victory in 1945. America is proud of her contribution to our common victory in 1918. But America is not so proud of the course she followed after the victory of 1918.

In 1918 I was a follower of Woodrow Wilson. I gloried in his idealism and in the magnificent effort he made to build the peace upon the covenant of the League of Nations.

But the American people expected too much from Woodrow Wilson and supported him too little.

While he was in Paris working for peace, political opponents at home bitterly criticized his course and questioned his motives. They exaggerated and exploited the shortcomings of the Treaty of Versailles, and they belittled and besmirched what Woodrow Wilson had accomplished.

America failed to join the League of Nations. America refused to guarantee the defense of the French frontier. America allowed other countries to believe that she had no interest, and would not seriously concern herself, in what was happening in Europe, in Africa, or Asia.

But wars started, first in Asia, then in Africa, and then in Europe. Then came Pearl Harbor. America learned too late that this is one world and that she could not isolate herself from that world.

¹ An address delivered in Paris on Oct. 3 at the American Club and released to the press on the same date.

America is determined this time not to retreat into a policy of isolation. We are determined this time to cooperate in maintaining the peace. President Roosevelt this time sought to avoid the political opposition which had defeated the peace after the first World War. Then President Wilson neglected to invite the leaders of the political party in opposition to his administration to participate with him in making the peace.

President Roosevelt, on the other hand, asked the congressional leaders to participate in the peace studies being made by the Department of State shortly after our entry into the war.

At Yalta, immediately after the heads of government had agreed to call the San Francisco conference to draw up the Charter for the United Nations, President Roosevelt advised Secretary Stettinius and me that he would appoint on the Delegation to the San Francisco conference Republicans as well as Democrats, and would name Senator Vandenberg as the ranking Republican member of the Delegation.

Even before our entry into the war, President Roosevelt repudiated the idea that the United States was not interested in what takes place in Europe. Knowing from the start that the war was a war of aggression, he never asked the American people to be neutral in spirit.

Before we entered the war, he inspired the declaration of principles known as the Atlantic Charter, which was proclaimed by him and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on August 14, 1941.

It was President Roosevelt who at Yalta presented the declaration on liberated Europe which Generalissimo Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill accepted and which imposed a responsibility upon the three governments to continue their interest in the Balkan states and uphold the basic freedoms embodied in that declaration.

The policies inaugurated by President Roosevelt have been consistently followed by his successor, President Truman. He has consistently urged the carrying out in the liberated and ex-enemy states of Europe of the policies agreed to by the heads of government at Yalta at the instance of President Roosevelt.

President Truman continued the practice of seeking the cooperation of the leaders of both major political parties in the making of peace.

It was with the approval of President Truman that I invited Senator Vandenberg as well as Senator Connally to assist me in the drafting of the peace treaties.

And President Truman reenforced this bipartisan policy by appointing Senator Austin our representative on the Security Council of the United Nations.

The President has recently made known to the world in the most convincing manner possible that the foreign policy which was started by President Roosevelt and which has been consistently followed by President Truman will continue to be the policy of the American Government.

Because that policy is supported by Republicans as well as Democrats, it gives assurance to the world that it is our American policy and will be adhered to regardless of which political party is in power.

Because today we have such a policy I was able to say recently, with the approval of the President, and I am happy to be able to reaffirm here in France, that so long as there is an occupation army in Germany the armed forces of the United States will be in the army of occupation.

I would not want you to believe that our course in this regard is entirely unselfish. It is true that the United States wants no territory and seeks no discriminatory favors. The United States is interested in one thing above all else, a just and lasting peace.

The people of the United States did their best to stay out of two European wars on the theory that they should mind their own business and that they had no business in Europe. It did not work.

The people of the United States have discovered that when a European war starts our own peace and security inevitably become involved before the finish. They have concluded that if they must help finish every European war it would be better for them to do their part to prevent the starting of a European war.

Twice in our generation doubt as to American foreign policy has led other nations to miscalculate the consequences of their actions. Twice in our generation that doubt as to American foreign policy has not brought peace, but war.

That must not happen again.

France, which has been invaded three times in the last 75 years by Germany, naturally does not

want to be in doubt as to American foreign policy towards Germany.

To dispel any doubt on that score the United States has proposed that the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States shall enter into a solemn treaty not only to disarm and demilitarize Germany but to keep Germany disarmed and demilitarized for 40 years. And the treaty can be extended if the interests of international peace and security require.

On June 5, 1945, Generals Eisenhower, Zhukov, Montgomery, and De Tassigny entered into an agreement providing in detail for the disarmament and demilitarization of Germany.

The treaty I proposed on behalf of the United States contains all the provisions of that agreement. It provides that all German armed forces, all para-military forces, and all the auxiliary organizations shall be kept demobilized. It provides further that the German General Staff and the staffs of any para-military organizations shall be prohibited and no German military or para-military organizations in any form or disguise shall be permitted in Germany. It provides for the complete and continued demilitarization of her war plants and for a continuing system of quadripartite inspection and control to make certain that Germany does not rearm or rebuild her armament plants or reconvert her civilian industries for war.

So long as such a treaty is in force the Ruhr could never become the arsenal of Germany or the arsenal of Europe. That is a primary objective of the proposed treaty.

The United States is firmly opposed to the revival of Germany's military power. It is firmly opposed to a struggle for the control of Germany which would again give Germany the power to divide and conquer. It does not want to see Germany become a pawn or a partner in a struggle for power between the East and the West.

The United States does not oppose but strongly urges the setting up of effective inspection and control machinery to see that Germany does not rearm, does not rebuild her armament industries or convert her civilian industries for war.

We propose that the Allied occupation of Germany should not terminate until a German government does accept the required disarmament and demilitarization clauses. Even then the proposed treaty envisages the need for limited but adequate

Allied armed forces, not for occupation purposes but to insure compliance with the treaty.

To keep watch over war potential in this industrial age engineers are more important than infantry. Engineers can detect at an early stage any effort upon the part of a manufacturer of motor cars to convert his machinery to manufacture of tanks or other weapons of war. Engineers can probe the mysteries of a chemical plant; infantry soldiers cannot.

If violations are discovered they must be immediately reported to the Commission of Control. If the Commission of Control finds that the violations are not immediately corrected by orders of the engineer inspectors, the Commission should at once demand that the German Government close the plants and punish the violators of the treaty.

If the government does not comply, the Allied representatives in 24 hours should order the necessary forces to enforce compliance.

If the Allied representatives deem it necessary they should be in a position to call for bombers from France, Britain, the United States, or the Soviet Union. These planes could fly to Germany to enforce immediate compliance.

After the last war, the great French war leader, Clemenceau, hoped to secure a guaranty that the Allies would come to the aid of France if Germany violated her frontiers. But President Wilson failed in his effort to get the American people to join in such a guaranty.

This time the American people propose not to wait until France is again invaded. They offer now to join with France, Britain, and the Soviet Union to see to it that Germany does not and cannot invade France.

Mr. Bidault, on behalf of France, and Mr. Bevin, on behalf of Britain, have accepted in principle the treaty we have proposed. I hope very much that the Soviet Union, which thus far has regarded the treaty as unacceptable, will on further examination and study find it possible to join with us to prevent Germany again from becoming a menace to the peace of Europe.

The military representatives of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States easily reached an agreement providing for the disarming of the German people and the demilitarization of German plants, to continue until the peace settlement. The United States proposes to continue this disarming and

demilitarization for 40 years after the peace settlement.

If the Allied nations will enter into the treaty which the United States proposes to keep Germany disarmed and demilitarized for at least a generation, the people of France and the people of Europe need not fear the efforts of the German people to rebuild their devastated country and rebuild a peaceful Germany.

We do want to give encouragement to the peaceful, democratic forces of Germany. We cannot do this unless we do give them a chance to govern themselves democratically.

For our own security as well as for the welfare of the German people we do not want to see an overcentralized government in Germany which can dominate the German people instead of being responsible to their democratic will.

In the American zone, we have placed great emphasis upon the development of a sense of local responsibility and have taken the lead in creating *länder* or states so that the people will look to the states and not to a central government on all matters that do not basically require national action.

We want to see the federal government of Germany created by the states and not the states created by the central government. If we so proceed we do not think we will find that the responsible representatives of the states will want to give excessive powers to the federal government.

We want a peaceful, democratic, and disarmed Germany which will respect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all her inhabitants and which will not threaten the security of her neighbors.

We want such a Germany not because we want to appease Germany, but because we believe that such a Germany is necessary to the peace and security of France, our oldest ally, and is necessary to the peace and security of a free and prosperous Europe.

After every great war which has been won by the combined efforts of many nations, there has been conflict among the Allies in the making of peace. It would be folly to deny the seriousness of the conflict in viewpoints among the Allies after this war.

To ignore that conflict or minimize its seriousness will not resolve the conflict or help us along the road to peace. To exaggerate that conflict and

its seriousness, on the other hand, only makes more difficult the resolution of the conflict.

I concur most heartily in the view recently expressed by Generalissimo Stalin that there is no immediate danger of war. I hope that his statement will put an end to the unwarranted charges that any nation or group of nations is seeking to encircle the Soviet Union, or that the responsible leaders of the Soviet Union so believe.

I do not believe that any responsible official of any government wants war. The world has had enough of war. The difficulty is that while no nation wants war, nations may pursue policies or courses of action which lead to war. Nations may seek political and economic advantages which they cannot obtain without war.

That is why if we wish to avoid war we must destroy not only war but the things which lead to war.

Just because war is not now imminent, we must take the greatest care not to plant the seeds of a future war. We must seek *less* to defend our actions in the eyes of those who already agree with us, and *more* to defend our actions in the eyes of those who do not agree with us. But our defense must be the defense of justice and freedom, the defense of the political and economic rights not of a few privileged men or nations but of all men and all nations.

It is particularly appropriate that here in the birthplace of the doctrine of the rights of man I should reaffirm the conviction of the Government and the people of the United States that it is the right of every people to organize their own destiny through the freest possible expression of their collective will. The people of the United States believe in freedom for all men and all nations, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, freedom to progress. The people of the United States have no desire to impose their will upon any other people or to obstruct their efforts to improve their social, economic or political conditions. In our view human freedom and human progress are inseparable.

We want to give the common men and women of this world who have borne the burdens and sufferings of war a chance to enjoy the blessings of peace and freedom. We want the common men and women of this world to share in the rising standards of life which science makes possible in a free, peaceful, and friendly world.

Statement by the President on the Palestine Situation

[Released to the press by the White House October 4]

I have learned with deep regret that the meetings of the Palestine Conference in London have been adjourned and are not to be resumed until December 16, 1946. In the light of this situation it is appropriate to examine the record of the administration's efforts in this field, efforts which have been supported in and out of Congress by members of both political parties, and to state my views on the situation as it now exists.

It will be recalled that, when Mr. Earl Harrison reported on September 29, 1945, concerning the condition of displaced persons in Europe, I immediately urged that steps be taken to relieve the situation of these persons to the extent at least of admitting 100,000 Jews into Palestine.¹ In response to this suggestion the British Government invited the Government of the United States to cooperate in setting up a joint Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, an invitation which this Government was happy to accept in the hope that its participation would help to alleviate the situation of the displaced Jews in Europe and would assist in finding a solution for the difficult and complex problem of Palestine itself. The urgency with which this Government regarded the matter is reflected in the fact that a 120-day limit was set for the completion of the Committee's task.

The unanimous report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry was made on April 20, 1946, and I was gratified to note that among the recommendations contained in the Report was an endorsement of my previous suggestion that 100,000 Jews be admitted into Palestine.² The administration immediately concerned itself with devising ways and means for transporting the 100,000 and caring for them upon their arrival. With this in mind, experts were sent to London in June 1946 to work out provisionally the actual travel arrangements. The British Government cooperated with this group but made it clear that in its view the Report must be considered as a whole and that the issue of the 100,000 could not be considered separately.

On June 11, I announced the establishment of a Cabinet Committee on Palestine and Related Problems, composed of the Secretaries of State, War, and Treasury, to assist me in considering

the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry.³ The alternates of this Cabinet Committee, headed by Ambassador Henry F. Grady, departed for London on July 10, 1946, to discuss with British Government representatives how the Report might best be implemented. The alternates submitted on July 24, 1946 a report, commonly referred to as the "Morrison plan",⁴ advocating a scheme of provincial autonomy which might lead ultimately to a bi-national state or to partition. However, opposition to this plan developed among members of the major political parties in the United States—both in the Congress and throughout the country. In accordance with the principle which I have consistently tried to follow, of having a maximum degree of unity within the country and between the parties on major elements of American foreign policy, I could not give my support to this plan.

I have, nevertheless, maintained my deep interest in the matter and have repeatedly made known and have urged that steps be taken at the earliest possible moment to admit 100,000 Jewish refugees to Palestine.

In the meantime, this Government was informed of the efforts of the British Government to bring to London representatives of the Arabs and Jews, with a view to finding a solution to this distressing problem. I expressed the hope that as a result of these conversations a fair solution of the Palestine problem could be found.⁵ While all the parties invited had not found themselves able to attend, I had hoped that there was still a possibility that representatives of the Jewish Agency might take part. If so, the prospect for an agreed and constructive settlement would have been enhanced.

The British Government presented to the Conference the so-called "Morrison plan" for provincial autonomy and stated that the Conference was open to other proposals. Meanwhile, the Jewish

¹ For text of Mr. Harrison's report to the President, see BULLETIN of Sept. 30, 1945, p. 456; and for the statement of the President, see BULLETIN of Nov. 18, 1945, p. 790.

² For text of the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, see Department of State publication 2536.

³ For text of the Executive order establishing the Committee, see BULLETIN of June 23, 1946, p. 1069.

⁴ Not printed.

⁵ BULLETIN of Aug. 25, 1946, p. 380.

Agency proposed a solution of the Palestine problem by means of the creation of a viable Jewish state in control of its own immigration and economic policies in an adequate area of Palestine instead of in the whole of Palestine. It proposed furthermore the immediate issuance of certificates for 100,000 Jewish immigrants. This proposal¹ received wide-spread attention in the United States, both in the press and in public forums. From the discussion which has ensued it is my belief that a solution along these lines would command the support of public opinion in the United States. I cannot believe that the gap between the proposals which have been put forward is too great to be bridged by men of reason and good-will. To such a solution our Government could give its support.

In the light of the situation which has now developed I wish to state my views as succinctly as possible:

1. In view of the fact that winter will come on before the Conference can be resumed I believe and urge that substantial immigration into Palestine cannot await a solution to the Palestine prob-

lem and that it should begin at once. Preparations for this movement have already been made by this Government and it is ready to lend its immediate assistance.

2. I state again, as I have on previous occasions, that the immigration laws of other countries, including the United States, should be liberalized with a view to the admission of displaced persons. I am prepared to make such a recommendation to the Congress and to continue as energetically as possible collaboration with other countries on the whole problem of displaced persons.

3. Furthermore, should a workable solution for Palestine be devised, I would be willing to recommend to the Congress a plan for economic assistance for the development of that country.

In the light of the terrible ordeal which the Jewish people of Europe endured during the recent war and the crisis now existing, I cannot believe that a program of immediate action along the lines suggested above could not be worked out with the cooperation of all people concerned. The administration will continue to do everything it can to this end.

U. S. Policy in Korea

STATEMENT BY ACTING SECRETARY ACHESON

[Released to the press October 11]

At his press conference on October 1 the Acting Secretary of State was asked if the United States intended to allow the Russians to continue pursuing independently their own policy in north Korea without taking positive steps to fulfil the pronouncements at Cairo and Moscow to establish a provisional government for Korea under joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. supervision. He was further asked what steps this country advocates to break the deadlock now existing between the United States and U.S.S.R. administrators in Korea.

Mr. Acheson authorized for direct quotation the following answer:

"General Hodge has in the past months made a number of efforts to bring about a reconvention of the Joint Soviet-American Commission. His efforts have not so far proven successful. When we consider it opportune we may again approach the Russians in this matter. We have informed them that we are prepared to meet with the Com-

mission at any time they wish, and we hope that they may soon see the reason and good sense in continuing the discussions of the Commission. In the meantime, as I said in my statement of last August 30, it is essential that we proceed in south Korea with the solution of urgent social and economic problems along lines which embody the will of the Korean people.² Therefore we desire to establish cooperation between all political parties and a Korean legislative body, to express Korean views and aspirations, and to provide Korean leadership.

"At the time I made this statement I emphasized two main points. One is that we are prepared at any time that the Soviet Government will do so, to resume the discussions of the Commission, the purpose of which is to bring about a unified Korea. The other is that we intend to remain in Korea and carry out our duties there until we have achieved the purpose of bringing into being a united, independent Korea.

"We must be patient and persevering in reaching a solution of this problem."

¹ Not printed.

² BULLETIN of Sept. 8, 1946, p. 462.

A New Instrument of U. S. Foreign Policy

BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BENTON¹

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Geography, language differences, and political boundaries have never been barriers to the free flow of bacteria. Bacteria affect and strike the rich and the publishers, along with the poor and the readers. Illness, suffering, and death throughout history have been remarkably disrespectful of national sovereignty. They have not distinguished among the Argentines, the Portuguese, and the Greeks—or the nurses, the physicians, and the board of trustees.

Those who care for the stricken have always been leaders among world internationalists.

I am very happy, therefore, to attend this international dinner of the American Hospital Association. It is especially fitting at this time that your association should make this an international dinner and turn its attention outwards across national boundaries. Efforts of private groups, such as your association, to increase the flow of knowledge and skills across national frontiers contribute greatly to the kind of understanding we must have in this desperately troubled world. The role of the Government in promoting this understanding is primarily to stimulate and make easier the efforts of such private organizations as yours. Only secondarily, our Government's role is to do the necessary things that private organizations do not or cannot do.

Great doctors have always freely shared their ideas, their discoveries, and their skills. There has never been any national monopoly or national exploitation of medical knowledge. As a result, millions of people living in the world today have been given additional decades of life expectancy.

America has learned most of what she knows from other countries in medicine, as in other sciences. There is no one nation which can claim even a large proportion of the great medical discoveries. But America through its citizens has been a leader in furthering international cooperation in medicine and in public health.

Even a hundred years ago the American idea of the importance of health spread with almost every American settlement abroad. My own grandmother in the 1840's married a missionary and went

to Syria for 33 years. Before leaving she took a not-too-long course in alleged nursing, and later, because there were no trained doctors or nurses in her area in Syria, she achieved local fame as a rare medical wizard—at least, so the family legend goes.

Today our medical and other scientific and technical experts are in demand on all continents.

During the 13 months I have been associated with the Department of State, I have had the privilege of serving as chairman of a unique governmental body known as the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. This Committee coordinates the international activities of 12 Government agencies, representing 42 separate bureaus. It is through this Committee that Government projects of scientific and cultural cooperation abroad are integrated with United States foreign policy. It is through this Committee, for example, that a project of the Public Health Service for training nurses in Liberia would be cleared with the State Department, or through which a request from the Liberian Government, say for a malaria survey, would be passed on to the Public Health Service.

This Interdepartmental Committee is part of the mechanism through which we conduct the Government's over-all program of international information and cultural affairs.

Our foreign information program is a blood brother, though an entirely separate unit. Through the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs we keep information about the United States flowing to foreign countries through the powerful new communications instruments of our age—the press, motion picture, and the radio. But it is through our programs of scientific and cultural cooperation—and in that rather vague phrase I include the exchange of students, professors, technicians, and specialists, and the extension of medical, scientific, and technical assistance—that we may per-

¹An address delivered at the International Dinner of the American Hospital Association in Philadelphia, Pa. on Oct. 1 and released to the press on the same date.

haps make the greatest impact in the long run, if Congress authorizes a program of sufficient scope.

Information alone is a powerful weapon; it can sway people and it can even "sell" them a point of view. However, for true understanding actual experience is essential. Many people learn better by doing than by talking and by listening. In order to build friendship for the United States, we need to supplement the word with living people who can interpret, demonstrate, and work along with people of other nations in their local towns and villages. And we must get to know the students, professors, and scientists of other countries. We must thus suit the action to the word, the word to the action.

Premier Stalin gave the world some interesting words last week. Many are wondering what comfort to take from them. Many are wondering what action will accompany these words.

There was one phrase in Stalin's statement that was easy to miss, overshadowed as it was by immediate political questions. But this line was especially interesting to me, and may prove potentially important for the State Department's program of cultural relations.

Alexander Werth, a British correspondent, asked Generalissimo Stalin what in his opinion could help in the establishment of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain, a condition, he said, eagerly desired by the broad masses of English people. Here was Stalin's reply: "I really believe in the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Establishment of such relations would be appreciably helped by strengthening political, trade, and *cultural relations* between these countries" [italics Mr. Benton's].

I am greatly encouraged that Premier Stalin goes on record that he desires to strengthen cultural relations with Great Britain. And my hope is that implicit in his statement there is the idea that he wants to strengthen cultural relations with the United States. The State Department advocates a program of exchange of students, professors, technicians, and specialists with the Soviet Union. We have been informed, however, that the physical conditions of life in the Soviet Union, and the present lack of facilities, make it difficult for the Soviet Union to provide for the welfare of American students, professors, technicians, and specialists.

Perhaps we now have reason to hope for faster progress towards the goal we advocate. That hope is strengthened by news reports from Moscow that the universities of Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities have been thrown open to students from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. The press reports that 16 Bulgarian students already have arrived, and that Czech and Yugoslav students are expected to arrive soon. Thus I have much hope that we may be able soon to persuade the Soviet Government to extend to American students the same facilities which are now beginning to be provided for foreign students from the Soviet Union's Slavic neighbors.

While these seemingly encouraging developments are occurring in the Soviet Union, our informational and cultural program, as you must have read in the papers, has suffered an apparent setback at the hands of Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. As you know, the library and reading-room of the United States Information Service in Belgrade, and the cultural activities carried on by our Embassy, have been temporarily closed down at the request of the Yugoslav Government. We have not yet accepted this as a final answer by the Yugoslav Government, and negotiations are now in progress. Incidentally, it is interesting that the Yugoslav Government seems to be restricting our information and cultural relations with Yugoslavia at a time when Marshal Stalin has at least indicated his willingness to promote cultural relations with Great Britain, and I hope with the United States.

I don't like the phrase *cultural relations* to describe the important program of the State Department which is covered by this phrase. This program is an important instrument of foreign policy. The phrase seems to be about the best name that we can find for it. The phrase *cultural relations* in French more accurately describes our program than the connotation of the phrase *cultural relations* in English. I think that is because the French, being realists, long ago realized more fully than we in Britain and America the important relation between the spread of a culture and political fact. The French have never scorned cultural relations, whereas many Americans have tended to think of cultural relations merely in terms of art exhibits, choral societies, and the like. But we in America are learning that the promotion of cultural relations between peoples, in their broad and

all-inclusive sense, is at the heart of the problem of political relations.

Let me give you some examples of the practical projects that the rather ambiguous term *cultural relations* includes.

Since 1939 we have had an interesting experimental laboratory for cultural relations with Latin America. Nelson Rockefeller, as coordinator of cultural relations with Latin America, promoted scores and indeed hundreds of projects financed jointly by the United States and Latin American republics. These projects were undertaken primarily to cement hemisphere solidarity, immediately before and during the war. Nevertheless, their peacetime value has never been underrated. I shall describe a few of them.

Picking almost at random a few examples, I might cite the two cooperative radiosonde stations, in Mexico and in Cuba, where scientific instruments are sent up into the stratosphere in balloons to secure data on the air currents which affect the weather not only in Mexico and Cuba but all through our South, Middlewest, and east coast as well. These data are of great value to our aviation and our shipping, as well as to our farmers.

Another important cooperative project has been our rubber experimental station in Colombia. Only a few months ago at one of our jointly operated stations, a new type of blight-resistant rubber was developed which is suitable for small plantings as well as for large plantations. This discovery has vast implications for Colombia. It is also useful to us. Among other things, it can give us a supply of much-needed raw material just a short distance away, in this hemisphere.

Many other agricultural projects of a similar nature have been undertaken. An evidence that these projects are in fact cooperative is that co-operating countries spend over \$3 for every \$1 spent by the United States Government.

Public-health projects have included the building of several American hospitals, to serve as models. The hospital in Peru, for example, offers a clinic and a visiting-nurse service and is a center of health information for the entire country. It is now run by a Peruvian staff, with the help of two American doctors and four American nurses.

In 18 countries American physicians, engineers, and nurses joined forces with their Latin American counterparts to set up cooperative public-

health projects. These projects are now being taken over by local governments.

The Office of Inter-American Affairs, under Mr. Rockefeller, also set up demonstration water-supply systems; translated and distributed medical books and pamphlets; distributed films and circulated exhibits. Help was given in setting up departments of vital statistics in several countries. These and similar programs are reducing the death rate substantially in Latin America, where, before the war, it was almost twice as high as in this country.

In addition, in Latin America, the Government has set up "cultural institutes" which function as libraries and as schools in United States life and customs. Also, since 1939 we have brought up to the United States for study and investigation about 800 students and 500 professors and specialists from the other American republics, and we have sent south 40 American students and 200 professors and specialists.

I would like very much to be able to tell you about similar projects in other parts of the world. But that I cannot do because the State Department's program of cultural and scientific cooperation is in effect only in Latin America. Under wartime authority the Department has carried out some few projects of technical and scientific assistance in other parts of the world, notably in China and the Middle East, but legislation authorizes this kind of activity in peacetime only for the countries of Latin America.

The State Department does have the authority to carry on our world-wide information program; we maintain information staffs and libraries all over the world, and we can carry on radio broadcasts and send to all missions abroad our documentary films. It is only our scientific and cultural program that is restricted to Latin America.

Authority for expanding this program to the rest of the world was contained in a bill introduced in the last session of Congress. The bill, H. R. 4982, won the unanimous support of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and passed the House with a large majority. It was also approved by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations but failed to come to a final vote in the Senate on the last day of the session because of the pressure of other legislation.

A similar bill will be introduced when Congress reconvenes next January, and it will need the ac-

tive support of all those who believe in this new approach to foreign relations.

The Bloom bill did not become law in the last session of Congress, but the Fulbright bill did. This law makes it possible for the United States to sell its surplus properties abroad for currency or credits which can be used for such things as the study of American students abroad, or the sending of American visiting professors to lecture, to teach, or to do research in a foreign university. These funds can also be used to pay the transportation of foreign students and professors to the United States.

I cannot at this time give you many details about this program, but it is potentially a very important facet of our larger cultural-relations program.

There are some skeptics who still may wonder why the United States should carry on scientific, technical and cultural projects in foreign countries in time of peace. Anyone can justify such projects in wartime on grounds of military necessity. But the skeptics wonder why money should be spent in this manner from now on.

In my opinion these projects are more than ever necessary now.

In the first place, by helping other people to improve their health and way of life we create conditions favorable to the development of freedom and democracy, and this is the surest and most direct way to work against war. By lending technicians and specialists we help to raise living standards in countries where technology has not been developed as rapidly as in the United States. By advising on agricultural techniques, by improving nutritional standards, by reducing disease, we are attacking low living standards at their source. By advising on electric-power development, mining techniques, and transportation we are creating the means by which other peoples can better help themselves.

In the second place, even from a purely selfish, national point of view, investment of technical skill abroad pays high dividends. When living standards are raised abroad, a greater flow of trade with the United States is automatically promoted. Other countries can buy our automobiles and refrigerators only if we help increase their efficiency and thus their prosperity by sharing our technical and scientific skills with them.

Finally, by sharing our skills we build up a true understanding of America, the kind of un-

derstanding that promotes good neighbors in times of peace and firm friends in times of crisis. In working with us, the peoples of other countries learn about us as a people—our attitudes, our objectives, our national character and way of life. They come to know our democratic Government, our legal procedures, and our respect for individual liberty.

By way of illustration, I would like to tell you of some of the projects we had in mind *if* the bill "to promote the interchange of persons, knowledge and skills" had finally passed. It isn't easy to cite specific examples because we live in a fast-changing world where needs are not static.

Projects for Europe would involve chiefly the exchange of students, professors, specialists, and technicians. European countries desperately need our help in training new professors and technicians, in filling the gaps in their knowledge left by the intellectual and scientific blackout of the war years.

Europeans are today avidly interested in the latest American developments in aviation, refrigeration (about which they know very little), medicine, and hundreds of other technical and scientific fields where progress has been greatest in recent years. European students and technicians want to come to this country to study recent developments, and they also want all the information we can send to them abroad. Europe, too, has made progress of which we should be informed.

Medical information has been one of the subjects of greatest interest. One large American exhibit on public health has toured all over Europe. When shown in Moscow, along with a display of 300 medical and scientific books, over 250 medical experts attended in the first three days.

The Government of India is at present seeking in this country experts in fruit growing, dairying, soil conservation, and fishing. It is also seeking a sanitary engineer and a director of veterinary service.

In China there is a great need for experts in public administration to aid in setting up local representative government units. The Chinese seem eager to benefit by American experience in self-government.

Reforestation is an urgent need in China, as is animal breeding, crop improvement, flood and ero-

ion control. Help is needed in creating industries of all kinds. About 200 young Chinese now want to come to this country to study in our mills and factories. Public health and sanitation, law, and business administration are other fields where opportunities in China are limitless.

Ceylon is now requesting the Bureau of Reclamation in Washington to examine designs for various proposed irrigation projects.

These are the types of cooperative cultural and technical programs the State Department had contemplated for this current year and which we hope to be able to carry through just as soon as Congress provides the necessary authorization. Though potentially enormous in their effect, their cost is relatively small. All projects must be cooperative, and we shall never embark on them unless other governments are working with us and underwriting costs with us.

Many other governments, before the war, recognized the need for spending money on such cultural and scientific cooperation. We are a late-comer in this field. The overt operation of cultural exchanges started with France back in the 1870's. The Russians over the last 20 years have been alive to the influence of cultural exchanges. The State Department has no accurate information on the extent of the Russian program. Great Britain, a late-comer too, set up what is known as the British Council in 1935 to promote knowledge of British thought and way of life.

I believe it might be said that the only unique part of our proposed program in the United States is its emphasis upon *cooperative* projects of a scientific and technical nature.

Until we made a beginning in Latin America in 1939, the United States had no program in this field. American jazz and motion pictures had been our two great so-called "cultural" exports. In Damascus I remember some years ago visiting three night clubs in an attempt to find some Arab music and dancing. All I could find were three German bands, all playing very bad and old American jazz.

But the time has gone when we as a nation can afford to be indifferent to our scientific, educational, and cultural exports. If there is any hope for the world, it is that the *peoples* of the world, all of whom want peace, will understand each other and will be willing to tolerate differences because they understand them.

One way to true understanding between people is through the actual process of helping each other.

I can assure you that it is not easy to create in this country the kind of public understanding of this problem that results in congressional acts and appropriations. The function of cultural, scientific, and technical cooperation as an indispensable adjunct to foreign policy is too new in this country to be widely understood. But when I consider how far we have come since 1939 I am greatly encouraged. Up until 1939, the foreign relations of this Government were carried on almost wholly through governments speaking to governments via diplomatic notes and conversations. The pattern hadn't changed appreciably in the more than a century and a half of our existence as a nation. The organization and procedures of the State Department were substantially the same as those of the days of Jefferson.

The major aim of the foreign policy of the United States is to promote peace, and today—1946—we know that, since wars begin in the minds of men, the defenses of peace must be constructed in the minds of men, through dispelling ignorance, suspicion, fear, through bringing peoples of all nations together at the working level, and by letting them get to know each other by helping each other.

We are therefore now altering our State Department organization and procedures.

We already have about twice as many people in the Department working on an informational and cultural program than the entire staff of the Department in 1939. Moreover, the Department has taken the lead in the organization of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which will seek, at the international level, to encourage peoples to speak to peoples across national boundaries. The Department is playing and will continue to play a large role in the work of this organization—known, by its initials, as UNESCO.

But the need is infinite. And we have a long way to go before this new instrument of United States foreign policy will be operating on the scale that will be necessary if the chief aim of the United States foreign policy is to be achieved. That aim is peace, and that aim can only be achieved by understanding.

Further Protest to Yugoslavia Against Disregard For Allied Military Regulations in Zone A

[Released to the press September 30]

Text of a note from Acting Secretary Clayton, delivered to Sava N. Kosanovic, Ambassador of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia in Washington, on September 27, 1946

The Acting Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Ambassador of the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, and has the honor to inform His Excellency that a full report has now been received from the American military authorities in Venezia Giulia regarding the arrest of six Yugoslav soldiers and the alleged detention of Captain Segota and his escort at Trieste on September 9, 1946, as set out in His Excellency's note Pov. Br. 1326 of September 16, 1946.

This report confirms that six soldiers from the Yugoslav Train Detachment, used for guarding UNRRA supplies, were arrested by American Military Police at 3:25 a.m. on September 9 at a point in Trieste near which a large explosion had just occurred.

These soldiers were searched and found to be carrying hand grenades concealed in their clothing, contrary to standing instructions that UNRRA guards were not to be armed, and were therefore handed over to custody of the Venezia Giulia Civil Police. Further investigation showed that the Yugoslav soldiers were apparently not connected with the large explosion, near the scene of which they had been arrested, and they were therefore escorted to Headquarters of the Yugoslav Detachment on September 11, with instructions that they be sent out of Zone A for violation of the standing orders against carrying weapons.

The Government of the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia must have been aware, at the time its protest was addressed to this Government, that the six Yugoslav soldiers had been released to the Yugoslav military authorities in Zone A, despite their violation of Allied military orders, and this Government is therefore unable to see any basis for a Yugoslav protest in this case. Instead, it appears that this Government must protest once again the disregard shown by officers and men of the Yugoslav Detachment in Zone A for Allied military regulations in that area.

As regards the alleged arrest of Captain Segota and his escort, the Acting Secretary is pleased to inform His Excellency that as a result of Captain Segota's protest to XIII Corps Headquarters, the Commanding General, 88 Division, United States Army, appointed a Board of Officers to investigate the incident. This Board of Officers has ascertained that Captain Segota, accompanied by four Yugoslav soldiers, arrived at the American Military Police Station in Trieste at about 4:00 a.m. on September 9 to demand the release of the six Yugoslav soldiers who had been arrested. He was informed at once that the six soldiers were in custody of the Venezia Giulia Civil Police. In the ensuing discussion, made difficult by the lack of a common language and the absence of an interpreter, the American Desk Sergeant, who was alone in the room at the time of Captain Segota's arrival, became apprehensive when the attitude of Captain Segota became menacing and the latter's escort surrounded the Desk Sergeant. He therefore drew his pistol and held the group under guard while he telephoned for the American Provost Marshal of Trieste. Meanwhile, the Desk Sergeant called other Military Police sleeping in an adjoining room, and with their assistance Captain Segota and his escort were searched and their documents checked. The Provost Marshal arrived at about this time, and after further discussion informed Captain Segota that the six soldiers could not be released but that he and his escort were of course free to leave at any time they wished.

In its findings, the Board of Officers held that disrespectful remarks or profane language had not been used against the Yugoslav military personnel, and that certain statements quoted by both Americans and Yugoslavs could not have been known positively because of the language barrier. The Board also held that under normal conditions the acts of the American Military Police would have been improper, but that against the background of the wounding of seven of their number by a hand grenade explosion on the previous day and the discovery during the preceding hour that Yugoslav soldiers in Trieste were illegally armed with hand grenades, and in the light of the Desk

Sergeant's apprehensions over the suspicious behavior of Captain Segota's escort and the inability of the two groups to understand one another, the detention under armed guard of the Yugoslav group until the arrival of a superior officer was justified. The Board recommended that no disciplinary action be taken, and that constant instructions be given to Military Police to be firm but fair in all of their dealings in an endeavor to avoid similar incidents in the future. The findings and recommendations of the Board of Officers have the full support of this Government, which is confident that if Yugoslav military personnel in Zone A will evince an attitude of loyal cooperation towards their Allied comrades in arms in Venezia Giulia they will meet with a most full and friendly response on the part of American military personnel.

At the same time, this Government desires the Yugoslav Government to know that it resents the charges that Allied military authorities took no steps in this matter and that they inspired a "fascist" press to give a "false" account of the incident, and that it rejects these charges as mischievous propaganda without any foundation in fact.

Discussion of Double Taxation Treaties With Belgium and Luxembourg

[Released to the press October 4]

The Department of State announced on October 4 that draft conventions have been formulated for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income taxes in discussions between a United States tax delegation and representatives respectively of the Governments of Belgium and Luxembourg.

These drafts have been submitted by the negotiators to their respective governments for further consideration with a view to signature.

Agreement upon the drafts with Belgium and Luxembourg completes the discussions of the United States tax delegation which has recently visited the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg for the purpose of exploring possible bases for conventions with those countries for the avoidance of double taxation.

Completion of a similar draft convention on the avoidance of double taxation with the Netherlands was announced by the Department on September 30, 1946.

"Avoidance of double taxation" treaties on income taxes are now in effect with Sweden, France, Canada, and the United Kingdom.

It is expected that a new convention with France modifying the convention of 1939 will be signed in the near future.

Leprosy Conference—Continued from page 664

(Leonard Wood Memorial), and various other private organizations have been asked to send representatives.

The United States Delegation is expected to include representatives of the United States Public Health Service and the American Leprosy Foundation.

The three principal topics which will be discussed at the conference are: (1) classification of leprosy; (2) epidemiology of leprosy; and (3) therapeutics in leprosy. Many South American experts disagree with the classification adopted at the Cairo conference in 1938, and recommendations for changes are expected to emerge from the Rio de Janeiro conference. Agreement on classification being fundamental to all studies of the disease, scientific workers should have a common understanding regarding terms that are used to designate the various types of the disease. Studies on epidemiology of the disease, and especially those relating to its relative prevalence under various environmental conditions, are of great importance. While the cause of leprosy is considered to be Hansen's bacillus and although the disease is exclusively human, the mode of transmission from sick to healthy persons is unknown. Transmission by some insect is still regarded as a possibility. Also, many consider that a defect in diet may lower natural resistance to the disease.

In the field of therapeutics, much of the discussion will center around the treatment of the disease with promin and diasone. Both are drugs of the sulfone group which have been synthesized in the United States. Favorable results have been reported from the leprosy institutions at Chachacare, Trinidad, and at Carville, Louisiana.

Conclusion of Agreement Providing for Operation of Ocean Weather Stations in North Atlantic

The Department of State announced on October 3 the conclusion of an agreement among North Atlantic countries to provide for the establishment and operation of 13 ocean weather stations along the air routes across the North Atlantic. The agreement, signed in London on September 26, will become effective upon acceptance by the nine signatory governments.¹

The United States Delegation to the London conference was comprised of representatives from the United States Coast Guard, United States Weather Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Administration, War and Navy Departments, and Bureau of the Budget, with a representative from the Department of State as the chairman of the United States Delegation. The Delegation was unanimous in urging that this Government sign the agreement.

The ocean weather stations are imperative for the safe and efficient operation of trans-Atlantic flights. Their provision has been an increasingly difficult problem since the withdrawal of stations provided by the United States military services and which served the heavy trans-Atlantic military traffic during the war. Designed for the observing and reporting of important weather data on the high seas, the ocean weather stations will provide needed navigational aids through radio beacons and other aeronautical equipment, and will also be able to assist in search and rescue operations in any emergency.

The Conference on North Atlantic Ocean Stations was called in London under the auspices of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (PICAO) and convened September 17, 1946. Governments represented at the conference included Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Although the Governments of Denmark, Iceland, Portugal, and Spain will not assist in the establishment of the ocean weather stations at this time, and hence did not sign the London agreement, provision is made in the agreement for the payment of cash contributions through the PICAO

¹ For text of the agreement see Department of State press release 697.

Interim Council should these Governments actively utilize the services provided by the stations.

The formula used as a guide in determining which governments should contribute for the provision and upkeep of the stations was based on the frequency of trans-Atlantic crossings expected to be flown by the airlines of the states involved. This formula was modified somewhat in order that the principle of contribution in kind rather than in cash could be followed as closely as possible.

The United States, which is expected to operate between 65 and 75 percent of total trans-Atlantic crossings through 1948, will provide and maintain seven of the ocean weather stations. In addition, the United States will operate one station in cooperation with Canada, who has agreed to share half the costs of this station. This Government thus will provide 58 percent of the total weather station program planned for the North Atlantic Ocean. The United Kingdom will operate two of the stations and will share in the operation of a third with Norway and Sweden. France will be responsible for one station, and Belgium and the Netherlands will share in the operation of the thirteenth station. Ireland has agreed to contribute 5,000 pounds annually for the upkeep of the 13 stations.

The stations for which the United States will be responsible will be operated by the U.S. Coast Guard. By the first of November, the Coast Guard expects to have four of the stations in operation. Each of the stations will have complete weather-reporting equipment which will be operated by personnel of the U.S. Weather Bureau.

The agreement has received enthusiastic endorsement by responsible aviation officials in this Government as well as by the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Chief of the Weather Bureau, the two agencies responsible for the operation of the ships to be used for the ocean weather stations. The weather data to be collected and disseminated every three hours daily by the stations will be useful not only to aviation and maritime interests but also to industry and agriculture generally, inasmuch as the data will be important to long-range weather forecasting.

The United States Delegation was as follows:

Delegate:

J. Paul Barringer, Assistant Chief, Aviation Division,
Department of State

Alternate Delegates:

Delbert M. Little, Assistant Chief, U.S. Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce

Laurence S. Kuter, Maj. Gen., U.S.A., U.S. Representative to Interim Council of PICAQ

Advisers:

Paul T. David, Assistant Chief, Fiscal Division, Bureau of the Budget

Garrett V. Graves, Commander, U.S.C.G., Chief, Aerology and Oceanography Section, Office of Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Coast Guard

Norman R. Hagen, Meteorological Attaché, U.S. Embassy, London, England

Advisers—Continued

Robert F. Hickey, Captain, U.S. Navy, London, England

Paul M. Huber, Major, U.S.A., Headquarters, Air Weather Service, Army Air Forces

Chris M. Lample, Chief, Air Navigation Facilities Service, Civil Aeronautics Administration

Harold G. Moore, Captain, U.S.C.G., Coordinator for International Affairs, Headquarters, U.S. Coast Guard

Charles I. Stanton, Deputy Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration

Peace: A Challenge to American Leadership**BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY HILLDRING¹**

Today we are faced with the necessity of making peace. Making peace is a complicated business, far more complicated than waging war. I have no doubt that we will win the peace, a good peace and a lasting peace, provided the people of the United States understand the part they must play in solving this problem. It is on this issue that I wish to speak to you today.

We fought World War I to preserve democracy, and we won most of the *battles* in that war. More importantly we won the *final battles* that brought about an armistice and a set of peace treaties dictated by the Allied powers. But did we really win World War I? In 1918, in 1928 — even in 1938 — most Americans would have answered that question in the affirmative.

It isn't necessary for me to recite all the events between the wars that clearly indicate that thinking Americans honestly believed that by winning the battles of World War I the Allied nations had protected and made secure their democratic institutions.

I will merely mention a few of the milestones that served as gages of the American attitude of those days. For one thing, we declined to participate in the League of Nations. But worse than that we engaged in one of the most disastrous intellectual retreats of modern times—a retreat to rock-ribbed isolation behind our two oceans. So impregnable was this position and so great was the sense of well-being in the American mind that it was incapable of comprehending the obvious meaning of German rearmament, of the brutal conquest of Abyssinia, of the invasion of Manchuria—even

of the threat of Fascist and Nazi ideologies. What I am trying to say is that most thinking Americans—yes, even most leaders of American thought—sat tranquilly in their ivory towers while the foundations of our civilization were being—I was going to say whittled away; rather, I should say, were being blasted away from under us.

But let's get back to the question. Did we really win World War I? If we fought the war in order to win battles, the answer is yes. But if we engaged in that war to make democracy secure, and I think that's why we fought, then I believe history has clearly demonstrated that we did not achieve by the lavish expenditure of our manhood and our treasure the objectives for which we waged the war.

And so along came World War II. By a spontaneous and Herculean effort on our part and by the miraculous resistance of our Allies, notably England and the Soviet Union, we have again won all of the battles. All fighting ceased over a year ago. But very regretfully I am forced to express the opinion that we have not as yet achieved any of the main objectives for which we fought World War II. *The war has not been won.*

That, my friends, is just where we find ourselves on this delightful September afternoon in 1946. The eradication of Fascism, the elimination of intolerance, the establishment of an enduring peace, these are the objectives for which we fought, and this is the part of the conflict which must be

¹An address delivered before the American Legion Convention in San Francisco, Calif., on Sept. 30 and released to the press on the same date.

won, if it is won at all, by the people themselves under intelligent and forceful civilian leadership.

It is the battle for peace. So far as the United States is concerned the soldiery for this battle is all the men and all the women of America.

You will be, or at least you should be, the leaders of our people in this great struggle.

"What exactly", you ask, "should we do?"

Let me start by telling you what shouldn't be done. We will never accomplish our purpose by negative measures. This isn't something that can be done without positive effort and without some sacrifices, individually and collectively. Several weeks ago a distinguished American informed me that he agreed with me that the United States should be represented in Berlin by the best mind in his field of endeavor the country possessed. No, he personally couldn't accept the position. Unfortunately, he was heavily committed at home. Ten other distinguished Americans in the same field of activity have given expressions of the same high purpose as to the caliber of the man we should send to Berlin, and all ten of them have been equally regretful of their inability to go to Berlin. That is not the sort of approach to the solution of world problems that I advocate.

Neither do I advocate adherence to our pre-war philosophy of virtue and weakness. If we are to discharge our responsibilities of leadership in the international field, we must be strong as well as good.

As for positive steps, effective leadership of civilian opinion will require active and intelligent interest in world affairs. It will require the same intellectual curiosity that the American now possesses with regard to the public school system in his community, to the cost of living, to the kind of movies his children sees, to the public health, to the tariff, and to the many other facets of our purely domestic existence. He must acquaint himself with the facts of life in the world at large. He should know, for example, what the elements of the problems in Germany are today, what implications these problems have to the future peace of the world, and he should know these things in order that he may mobilize the opinion of his community behind his Washington officials when they are right, and in order that he may set these same officials right when in his judgment they are wrong.

In a sense we must revise our views as to what constitutes a good citizen. Heretofore, it has been

a generally accepted theory that an American is a good citizen if he is a useful member of his community, if he votes regularly, and if he maintains an interest in civic and national affairs. I would like to submit the thought that this standard for citizenship and for civic leadership is today outmoded. Whether we like it or not, we are no longer all citizens of the world, and if we want the United States to be a peaceful and prosperous land, we must come to grips with the realization that our goal cannot be attained unless the rest of the world is also peaceful and has at least a minimum of economic stability and security.

You men of the Legion, for the most part, have planted your boots in the mud of nearly every country in the world.

You have had invaluable first-hand experience with our international obligations. You know pretty well the feelings and anxieties of the people you helped to liberate and of our Allies who helped us in World War II. These people without exception are looking to us today. They, like we, are beset by a multitude of problems. Better than any other class of our citizenry you understand that by helping them to solve their problems we will be making a most substantial and essential contribution to the solution of our own problems.

The foremost problems confronting us in connection with peacemaking, and in American foreign relations, are to be found today in the countries occupied by our military forces: Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea.

The defeat of the enemy military forces by the Allied powers solved one problem, but created others. Victory on the field of battle set the stage for one of the greatest experiments the world has known. This country has undertaken the responsibility of sharing in the complex task of governing approximately 175,000,000 people.

Millions of Europeans and Asiatics are now under our control. In determining their future we must somehow find, and we will find, a means of getting along with the other occupying powers with whom we share the responsibility for their control. To help you understand one facet of the problem, let me suggest that you magnify many times the clashing interests, the different points of view, and the motives revealed in your city council or State legislature, and you will begin to realize the complexities of the negotiations that must be undertaken before a common understand-

ing can be reached. After all, the differences reflected in a city council or State legislature are differences within one country, whereas the differences among the members of the Control Council in Berlin or Vienna are differences among four countries with respect to questions affecting the people of a fifth country.

No matter how difficult the task may be, we have undertaken the job of shaping the destinies of millions of persons along lines that we believe will be compatible with the future peace and prosperity of the world. The best thought, the ablest personnel, and the understanding and resources of this country are required to meet these responsibilities. I have said that this country has undertaken the task of governing millions of people in Europe and in Asia. We share that responsibility with the Soviets, the British, and the French, and, as is only natural, their views and ours sometimes differ as to the methods that are to be followed in obtaining ultimate objectives. We had similar differences with our Allies in planning strategy and tactics during the war. We worked out those differences then. I am confident that with patience, reason, and persistence we can iron out our differences now.

There is no place in the world where the interests of the great powers are more sharply outlined than in Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea. Basically, the United States wants to see these occupied countries demilitarized and democratized. I believe that our Allies share these views.

In Germany we are working to create a country that will no longer be a threat to peace, that will be able to contribute to the economic recovery of Europe, and that will develop conditions favorable for the growth of democratic institutions. In defeat, as in pre-war years, Germany remains the crossroads of Europe. Its transportation, its communications system, and its economy are essential to the prosperity of the continent of Europe. In order that Germany may effectively contribute to European economic recovery, it is our belief that Germany must be treated as one country and not as four countries. To that end, we have recently proceeded with the merger of the American and British zones of occupation. We hope to demonstrate the advantages to be derived from breaking down the artificial zonal barriers that have hitherto existed. It is our hope that the Russians and the French will soon merge

their zones with the American and British zones.

The Secretary of State, in his recent speech at Stuttgart, forcefully stated the direction toward which our policy will be aimed when the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and France meet later this year to consider the German question.

In the meantime, your Government is proceeding with the revision of the basic directive—J.C.S. Document 1067—to the American Commander in Germany. This directive guides the Commander of the United States Forces of the European Theater and lays down the policy which he will follow. The American position will be made clear not only in the Council of Foreign Ministers but also in the Allied Control Council in Berlin.

To turn now to the other major defeated country, Japan, we find that our objectives are generally the same as in Germany. We have been working to demilitarize Japan industrially as well as militarily. As in Germany, we are now embarking on a program to make Japan as self-sufficient as possible. The sooner Japan and Germany are able to pay their own way economically, the earlier the American Government can cease the appropriation of funds for use in those countries.

In Japan, our problems are somewhat simpler than they are in Germany, for we already have economic and internal political unity. There is an indigenous government in Japan, with jurisdiction over the whole country, with the result that the problem of exercising control over the Japanese is greatly simplified.

I do not wish to leave the impression that we have no problems in Japan. The task of eliminating certain industries and rehabilitating and stimulating others in the interest of creating a peaceful Japanese economy is a gigantic one.

With regard to Austria and Korea, our policy has called for a different approach from that with respect to Germany and Japan. We have treated Austria and Korea not as enemy countries but as liberated countries. With our Allies, we agreed that Austria should be a free, democratic, and independent country.

If the commitments of this country are to have any real meaning, we must make every effort to see that Austria is maintained as an independent and a united country in the heart of Europe. This

Government has a program of reconstruction for Austria that will provide financial and other assistance in order to aid the Austrians in developing their economy and in maintaining their political freedom.

As a result of the war, Korea has been liberated from Japanese rule. American policy calls for the establishment of a united, democratic, and independent Korea. As you may know, under the terms of the military occupation, northern Korea is held by the Soviet Army, while we administer the southern half of the country. We early sought to unite the two zones of Korea under a joint U.S.-Soviet commission. Unfortunately, that has been delayed owing to a difference of views between ourselves and our Russian colleagues.

I have cited only a few problems in only a few places, in an effort to indicate that high obstacles lie in the path to peace. These obstacles must be cleared or we must detour around them if we are to achieve peace. Peace will not fall in our lap; it must be worked for.

Success, to no small extent, depends upon the people of the United States. It is a challenge to American leadership that includes all Americans. The realization of this is not impossible, but it will take a lot of work, sacrifice, patience, and intelligence.

As I said before, it is the battle for peace. It is a cause in which the veteran has unique qualifications for leadership. It is the final battle of World War II.

U.S.-Argentine Negotiations on Air Transport Agreement Suspended

[Released to the press October 11]

The United States and the Argentine Delegations suspended on October 1, for the time being, negotiations relating to the conclusion of an air-transport agreement between the two Governments.

The Argentines insisted upon provision for the division of air traffic between the two countries according to a prescribed formula and also on limiting the frequency of schedules and the capacity of services to be offered. The United States upheld the view that international air traffic should be covered by free and fair competition between the national airlines of the respective Governments, subject to the safeguards which are a

part of the bilateral agreements the United States has concluded with many other countries.

Suspension of these conferences is temporary, and does not affect the continuance of American air services now being furnished by Pan American Airways and Panagra to Argentina. At the close of the conference it was pointed out to the Argentine Delegates that despite the absence of an air-transport agreement the Civil Aeronautics Act provided a means for the inauguration of new services by a properly designated Argentine carrier upon principles of reciprocity of treatment. It is believed that the Argentine carrier, FAMA, will file an application for such a permit pursuant to the act. Similarly, an application will be filed for the United States carrier, Braniff, with the Argentine authorities for permission, pending further developments, to fly the route certificated to it in the recent Latin American decision by the Civil Aeronautics Board, with the approval of the President of the United States. No present changes, other than improved services, are contemplated on the routes now being flown by Pan American and Panagra.

In the view of the State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board the discussions with the Argentine Delegation have proved helpful. Frank discussion was had on all aspects of air transportation, and agreement was reached on the general principle that the increase and improvement of air service between the United States and Argentina would redound to the mutual benefit of both countries. In the view of the United States representatives, however, full development of air transportation is not likely to be achieved until the type of arbitrary restrictions to which the United States is opposed is eliminated by international agreement.

Visit of Argentine Psychologist

Dr. Horacio J. A. Rimoldi, Director of the Institute of Psychology and professor of biology of the University of Cuyo, Mendoza, Argentina, is visiting the United States at the invitation of the Department of State. He plans to spend a year at the University of Chicago in taking advanced training and research work in the psychometric laboratory. His special interest is in the field of psychological measurement and related subjects. The University of Chicago has issued a supplementary grant to facilitate this project.

U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization¹

**TRANSMITTAL OF FINAL REPORT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BENTON
TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

September 27, 1946.

The Honorable

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State.

SIR:

I am honored to transmit to you the final report of the United States National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. This report was adopted unanimously by the members of the National Commission at the end of the session terminating its four-day meeting in Washington, September 23 through September 26.

This report highlights the most important recommendations of the National Commission to the United States Government, for advocacy by the United States Delegation at the forthcoming General Conferences of UNESCO in Paris in November. In addition to this general summary, there are many other proposals of vital importance which were adopted by the Commission growing out of the specialized studies by its round tables on education, natural sciences, social services, creative arts, cultural institutions, humanities, and mass communications.

I think you will agree that the National Commission recommendations are bold and constructive. It is the opinion of the National Commission, according to its report, that "the responsibility of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the present crisis is so great and so pressing that the Organization should not hesitate to employ any proper means, however novel or however costly, which give promise of success. The Organization is itself a new agency, daring in purpose and novel in structure. The means it employs should be appropriate to its nature. It must serve as the cutting edge for international action."

The Commission received with appreciation your message urging UNESCO to help clear away the barriers of suspicion and mistrust which divide

peoples. The Commission called upon President Truman who told them that the Commission could make the "greatest contribution in the history of the world to the welfare of the world as a whole, if it really goes at it in the spirit that is intended". He told the delegates he thought they were on the road to doing the job.

In my opening address to the Commission, I warned the members that their actions would be closely followed and often severely criticized, and that many demands would be made upon their time and energy. I dedicated the Commission to hard work.

I have attended many conferences, but I have never seen as sincere and hard working a group as this Commission proved to be this week. Many diverse viewpoints were represented, yet out of this diversity grew surprising unity. The Commission gives every promise of becoming, as you and I had hoped, the collective brain to the whole nervous system of American culture, science, education and means of communication.

In addition to the obligation imposed by Congress on the Commission, to advise the United States Government on its participation in UNESCO, there is a second role for its members of which they were deeply conscious. This is to act as liaison with the thousands of organizations in this country, and their millions of individual members, in carrying out the UNESCO program within the United States. Many of the members present and organizations represented are already proceeding energetically to fulfill this responsibility. For example, the General Federation of Women's Clubs proposes to devote the entire November issue of its magazine, which goes to three and a half million members, to the meeting of this National Commission and to the opportunities for achieving peace through understanding, for which UNESCO was created.

¹ Reprinted as Department of State publication 2635.

If UNESCO is to be in fact "the spearhead of the United Nations", as the Ambassador from France told the members of the Commission at its dinner, then this grass-roots activity, sponsored and promoted by the 100 members authorized for the National Commission, will help the American people achieve an understanding of the aims of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and the aims of American Foreign policy.

You will be surprised, perhaps, as were the members of the Commission, at the statement by one of the members that a new Gallup Poll showed that more than 30 percent of the people of the United States do not know that the United States is a member of the United Nations. This illustrates both the domestic need for the National Commission and its opportunity.

Perhaps of greatest interest to the so-called practical men of the world, as well as to their political leaders, will be the attitude unanimously expressed by this group towards the proposed UNESCO budget. The Commission stated that even if the program were to cost a billion dollars or more annually, it would be "cheap insurance" against another war. I may say that no such budget was contemplated because the Commission is fully aware that it is impossible to develop a sufficient number of hard-headed projects, with sound administration and with reasonable hope of success, to warrant any such sum in the near future. However, General Sarnoff estimated for one of the round tables that it would cost \$250,000,000 to develop the worldwide communications system required by the United Nations, capable of laying down a strong and consistent radio signal, in all major areas of the world, comparable to the signal now received from a local radio station. General Sarnoff says that such a world system is today technically feasible. Such a worldwide radio network is one of the proposals unanimously endorsed by the National Commission.

The Commission elected the following as its officers:

CHAIRMAN:

Milton Eisenhower, President,
Kansas State College of Agriculture and
Applied Science,
Manhattan, Kansas.

VICE CHAIRMEN:

Edward W. Barrett,
Editorial Director, *Newsweek*,
New York, New York.

Arthur H. Compton, Chancellor,
Washington University,
St. Louis, Missouri.

Waldo G. Leland,
American Council of Learned Societies,
Washington, D.C.

Outstanding in leadership and energy among the members present in Washington this week was Mr. Archibald MacLeish, who acted as Chairman of the Committee which drafted the attached report. Mr. MacLeish's long interest in UNESCO, and his contributions to the UNESCO Constitution when he acted as Chairman of the American Delegation in London last fall, are well known to you.

I may say that no experience I have had in my thirteen months in the State Department has moved me more deeply than the meeting this week of this new and unique organ created by Congress to advise the Department. As your representative at these meetings, I have been deeply stirred by the passionate desire of these distinguished private citizens to devote themselves to the same cause to which you are devoting yourself in Paris—the dispelling of the ignorance, mistrust and misunderstanding which is prevalent throughout the world today—and the substitution in their place of that moral and intellectual solidarity of mankind which is the goal of the UNESCO constitution.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM BENTON
Assistant Secretary

**REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION
FOR THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE**

To the Secretary of State

SIR: The United States National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, organized by you in accordance with Section 3 of House Joint Resolution

305 of the 79th Congress (Public Law 565, 79th Congress, Chapter 700, 2d Session), met in Washington from September 23 to September 26, 1946, to advise the Government of the United States and the United States Delegation to the first General

Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on matters relating to the Organization, and specifically on the position to be taken in the Organization by the United States Delegation.

The purpose of the Organization, as stated in its Constitution, is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture. The Organization is not conceived of, in other words, as an international undertaking to promote education and science and culture as ends in themselves, but rather, through education and science and culture, to advance the peace of the world.

In the opinion of the National Commission, the position to be taken by the American Delegation in the General Conference of the Organization should be determined by this purpose. The American Delegation should support those proposals for action by the Organization which give promise of advancing directly and significantly the cause of peace through understanding. The necessity of this labor grows clearer from day to day as the effects of misunderstanding and distrust and fear upon the conduct of international relations become increasingly evident. The recognition of the fundamental community of human interests which made possible the great collaborative effort of the war has diminished with time and change, and the possibility of common effort for peace and for security has diminished with it. To restore and make increasingly articulate the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind—to identify and analyze existing obstacles to that solidarity and to develop action which will strengthen or create forces to overcome them—is the most immediate and the most urgent need of our time.

In the opinion of the National Commission, the responsibility of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the present crisis is so great and so pressing that the Organization should not hesitate to employ any proper means, however novel or however costly, which give promise of success. The Organization is itself a new agency, daring in purpose and novel in structure. The means it employs should be appropriate to its nature. It must serve as the cutting edge for international action. If annual military expenditures of thirteen billion dollars for the defense of the people of the United States against attack are justified, ten percent of that amount,

and far more than ten percent, might well and wisely be expended to remove or greatly to reduce the danger of attack. It would be cheap insurance. In the first place, it is the consensus of military opinion that no adequate military defense against the weapons of modern warfare exists. In the second place, even if such measures were available, their cost in terms of life and suffering are so inestimably great that any action which would diminish the necessity for their use would be economical.

The budget of UNESCO cannot now be estimated. The National Commission believes, however, that a budget in the amount of a billion or a billion and a half dollars or even more might well be justified, if practicable and useful projects requiring such expenditures presented themselves. The National Commission pledges itself to support the Organization to the limits of its power so far as the contribution of the United States to the budget of UNESCO is concerned.

But though the American Delegation should be prepared to think and to act boldly and imaginatively in the General Conference of UNESCO, it should never forget, in the opinion of this Commission, that it represents a people deeply and firmly committed to certain fundamental propositions bearing upon the nature and destiny of man. It should hold unwaveringly to the absolute requirement of freedom of thought and freedom of expression as the basic means of arriving at the world understanding which is the immediate as well as the ultimate objective of the Organization's labors.

The Commission has considered a large number of proposals for action by the new Organization as developed by a Preparatory Commission established in London by the Conference of the United Nations which drafted the Constitution of the new Organization in November, 1945. These proposals will be reviewed at the meeting of the General Conference of UNESCO. Accordingly, the National Commission has considered the report of the Preparatory Commission as a point of departure and has not hesitated to develop and to advance additional or different ideas of its own. The present report of the Commission does not undertake to list in full the recommendations adopted by the National Commission in the various fields of UNESCO's activity. Many of these, specific and detailed in character, are submitted to

you in a document supplemental to this report for such use as you may think wise to make of them. The Commission believes that these recommendations should be supported by the American Delegation in so far as they are not inconsistent with the general principles laid down in this report. The recommendations here listed are the recommendations to which the Commission attaches greatest over-all and present importance. They are, moreover, recommendations which, in the opinion of the Commission, best illustrate the character of the work UNESCO should undertake.

We have arranged our proposals in terms of the functions of the Organization as defined in the first Article of its Constitution. Fundamentally, the concern of the Organization is with the relations of men to each other. It approaches these relations in terms of three kinds of international collaboration. First, international collaboration for the *preservation* of men's knowledge of themselves, their world and each other; second, international collaboration for the *increase* of that knowledge through learning, science and the arts; third, international collaboration for the *dissemination* of that knowledge through education and through all the instruments of communication between the peoples of the earth in order that understanding may replace mistrust and suspicion and the fear which leads to war.

In the opinion of the Commission, the order of present urgency puts the third of these functions first. The Commission, therefore, recommends at this time only a limited number of projects in connection with the first and second activities of the Organization.

(1) *International Collaboration for the Preservation of Men's Knowledge of Themselves, Their World, and Each Other.*

Here the Commission recommends that the American Delegation advance and support proposals for action looking toward the rehabilitation of libraries, museums, scientific laboratories and educational institutions and other depositories of the materials and tools of art and learning. The Commission does not feel that it is appropriate for the Organization under its Constitution to attempt the work of reconstruction and rehabilitation itself. The Organization is, however, the only body which can properly direct a general study of needs and draft a plan of action.

(2) *International Collaboration for the Increase of Men's Knowledge of Themselves, Their World and Each Other Through Learning, Science and the Arts.*

Here the Commission feels that the American Delegation should advance and support proposals looking toward the development of conditions more favorable to the creative and investigative work of artists, scientists and scholars. Where agencies capable of improving these conditions in whole or in part already exist, the Organization should give its active support and encouragement to their undertakings and should attempt to facilitate their cooperation with each other. Furthermore, the Organization should encourage the establishment of new agencies of this character where they are needed but do not already exist.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for studies by the Organization of social and international tensions which create obstacles to international understanding and therefore to peace, and for action by the Organization to encourage the development of appropriate means for their elimination.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for the establishment of new scientific and scholarly projects for research in fields in which work can most effectively be undertaken on an international basis, as, for instance, research in meteorology, oceanography, international health, and the study of epidemic diseases.

(3) *International Collaboration for the Dissemination of Men's Knowledge of Themselves, Their World and Each Other through Education and through all the Instruments of Communication.*

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for the establishment or the reestablishment of the means of international communication through education and through all other media where they are needed and where they are at present lacking.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for the establishment by the Organization, alone or in connection with the United Nations, of a world-wide radio network capable of laying down a strong and consistent signal in all major areas of the world.

The American Delegation should advance and

support proposals for the removal of obstacles to the free flow of information in accordance with the report of the Committee of Consultants to the Department of State on Mass Media and UNESCO. The Commission differs, however, with the Committee of Consultants in believing that the Organization should concern itself with the quality of international communication through the mass media and should give serious study to the means by which the mass media may be of more positive and creative service to the cause of international understanding and therefore of peace. The Organization should, of course, avoid at all times any act or suggestion of censorship.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for action to free the channels of international communication of obstacles created by discriminatory or unduly restrictive copyright legislation, discriminatory or unfair rates, or other similar practices or laws.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals that the Organization concern itself with the press, radio and motion pictures, and all other means of publication, reproduction and dissemination of materials, as instruments at the service of art, education, culture and scientific advancement in the labor of international understanding, and with the protection of the peoples of the world against any misuse of these media such as might result in their degradation and perversion to the point of fostering international ill-will and misunderstanding.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for the investigation by the Organization of methods of education for international understanding and for the development of attitudes conducive to peace. Such investigations should direct themselves to the processes by which nations organize and give practice, within their own boundaries, to their people in the arts of peaceful cooperation. They should be more than mere fact-finding investigations. They should be sociological studies of great scope and depth.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals that the Organization call a conference in the year 1947 on the principles, policies and procedures to be followed in the preparation of textbooks and other teaching materials. This Conference should include in its membership

classroom teachers from all educational levels, school administrators, writers, publishers, and other experts in the production and use of instructional materials.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for the exchange of students, teachers, scholars, artists, artisans, scientists, government officials, and others, active in the various fields of the Organization's work.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals looking to the increase and improvement of the access of the masses of the people throughout the world to printed and other materials of intellectual, informational and cultural significance. The Commission believes that the American Delegation should advance and support proposals for the development by the Organization of an effective system of international inter-library loan, in original or copy, together with the development of necessary international finding lists, and arrangements to avoid duplication in abstracting and bibliographical services.

The American Delegation should advance and support proposals for the encouragement of the establishment of popular library and museum systems in those areas of the world where such systems do not now exist.

Tax Treaty With the Netherlands

[Released to the press September 30]

Representatives of the United States and representatives of the Netherlands have completed discussions in The Hague exploring the possible bases for conventions for avoidance of double taxation with respect to income taxes and estate taxes.

As a result of these discussions there has been drawn up a draft convention which deals with income taxes and contains provisions also with respect to certain extraordinary taxes in the Netherlands. The draft convention is being submitted by the representatives of the two countries to their respective Governments for further consideration with a view to signature.

The discussions on estate taxes have not been completed. It is expected that the matter will be given further consideration in the near future by the authorities of the two countries.

Status of Civil Aviation Documents

FORMULATED AT CHICAGO, DECEMBER 7, 1944

Compiled as of October 2, 1946 by the Treaty Branch, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State

Dates of Signatures

Country	Final Act	Interim Agreement	Convention	Transit Agreement (Two Freedoms)	Transport Agreement (Five Freedoms)
Afghanistan.....	X	X	X	X	X
Australia.....	X	X	X	7/4/45	
Belgium.....	X	4/9/45	4/9/45	4/9/45	
Bolivia.....	X	X	X	X	X
Brazil.....	X	5/29/45	5/29/45		
Canada.....	X	X	X	2/10/45	
Chile.....	X	X	X	X	
China.....	X	X	X		X
Colombia.....	X	5/24/45			
Costa Rica.....	X	3/10/45	3/10/45	3/10/45	3/10/45
Cuba.....	X	4/20/45	4/20/45	4/20/45	4/20/45
Czechoslovakia.....	X	4/18/45	4/18/45	4/18/45	
Dominican Republic.....	X	X	X		X
Ecuador.....	X	X	X	X	X
Egypt.....	X	X	X	X	
El Salvador.....	X	5/9/45	5/9/45	5/9/45	5/9/45
Ethiopia.....	X	3/22/45		3/22/45	3/22/45
France.....	X	X	X	X	
Greece.....	X	X	X	X	
Guatemala.....	X	1/30/45	1/30/45	1/30/45	1/30/45
Haiti.....	X	X	X	X	X
Honduras.....	X	X	X	X	X
Iceland.....	X	X	X	4/4/45	4/4/45
India.....	X	X	X	X	
Iran.....	X	X	X	X	8/13/46
Iraq.....	X	X	X	X	
Ireland.....	X	X	X		

X indicates signatures under date of Dec. 7, 1944.

Country	Final Act	Interim Agreement	Convention	Transit Agreement (Two Freedoms)	Transport Agreement (Five Freedoms)
Lebanon.....	X	X	X	X	X
Liberia.....	X	X	X	X	X
Luxembourg.....	X	7/9/45	7/9/45	7/9/45	
Mexico.....	X	X	X	X	X
Netherlands.....	X	X	X	X	X
New Zealand.....	X	X	X	X	
Nicaragua.....	X	X	X	X	X
Norway.....	X	1/30/45	1/30/45	1/30/45	
Panama.....	X	5/14/45			
Paraguay.....	X	7/27/45	7/27/45	7/27/45	7/27/45
Peru.....	X	X	X	X	
Philippines.....	X	X	X	X	
Poland.....	X	X	X	X	
Portugal.....	X	X	X		
Spain.....	X	X	X	X	
Sweden.....	X	X	X	X	X
Switzerland.....	X	X	7/6/45	7/6/45	
Syria.....	X	X	X	7/6/45	7/6/45 (2)
Turkey.....	X	X	X	X	X (4)
Union of S. Africa.....	X	6/4/45	6/4/45	6/4/45	
United Kingdom.....	X	X	X	X (5)	
United States.....	X	X	X	X	X
Uruguay.....	X	X	X	X	X
Venezuela.....	X	X (6)		X (6)	X (6)
Yugoslavia.....	X				
Danish Minister.....	X	X	X	X	X
Thai Minister.....	X	X	X	X	X

The following reservations accompany the signatures:

(1) "Ad referendum concerning the fifth freedom enumerated in Art. I Section 1."

(2) "In accordance with the provisions of Art. IV Section 1 of this agreement the Netherlands Delegation hereby accept only the first four privileges in Art. I Section 1."

(Reservation relinquished by the Netherlands Sept. 21, 1945.)

(3) "In accordance with Art. IV section 1 of this agreement, Syria accepts only the first four privileges in Art. I section 1."

(4) "In accordance with the provisions of Art. IV section 1 of this agreement the Turkish dele-

gation hereby accept only the first four privileges in Art. I sect. 1 and leave the acceptance of the fifth privilege to the discretion of their government."

(5) "I declare that, failing later notification of inclusion, my signature to this Agreement does not cover Newfoundland."

(Reservation withdrawn by United Kingdom Feb. 7, 1945.)

(6) "La Delegación de Venezuela firma *ad referendum* y deja constancia de que la aprobación de este documento por su Gobierno está sujeta a las disposiciones constitucionales de los Estados Unidos de Venezuela."

(Interim, transit, and transport agreements accepted by Venezuela Mar. 28, 1946.)

Subsequent Action Taken

Country	Interim Agreement (Date of Acceptance)	Convention (Date of Deposit of Ratification or Adherence)	Transit Agreement (Date of Receipt of Note of Acceptance)	Transport Agreement (Date of Receipt of Note of Acceptance)
Afghanistan	5/16/45		5/17/45	5/17/45
Argentina	6/4/46	6/4/46 A	6/4/46	
Australia	5/19/45		8/28/45	
Belgium	4/17/45		7/19/45	
Bolivia	5/17/46			
Brasil	5/29/45	7/8/46		
Canada	12/30/44	2/13/46	2/10/45	
Chile	6/4/45			
China	6/6/45	2/20/46		6/6/45 (1)
Colombia	6/6/45			
Costa Rica				
Cuba				
Czechoslovakia	4/18/45		4/18/45	
Denmark	11/13/45			
Dominican Republic	1/25/46	1/25/46		1/25/46
Ecuador				
Egypt	4/26/45			
El Salvador	5/31/45		6/1/45	6/1/45
Ethiopia	3/22/45		3/22/45	3/22/45
France	6/5/45			
Greece	9/21/45		9/21/45	2/28/46 (2)
Guatemala				
Haiti	6/2/45			
Honduras	11/13/45		11/13/45	11/13/45
Iceland	6/4/45			
India	5/1/45 (3)		5/2/45 (3)	
Iran				
Iraq	6/4/45		6/15/45	
Ireland	4/27/45			
Lebanon	6/4/45			
Liberia	3/17/45		3/19/45	3/19/45
Luxembourg	7/9/45			
Mexico	5/22/45	6/25/46	6/25/46	
Netherlands	1/11/45		1/12/45	1/12/45 (4)
New Zealand	4/18/45 (5)		4/19/45 (5)	
Nicaragua	12/28/45	12/28/45	12/28/45	12/28/45
Norway	1/30/45		1/30/45	
Panama				
Paraguay	7/27/45	1/21/46	7/27/45	7/27/45
Peru	5/4/45	4/8/46		
Philippines	3/22/46		3/22/46 (6)	
Poland	4/6/45	4/6/45	4/6/45	
Portugal	5/29/45			
Spain	7/30/45		7/30/45	
Sweden	7/9/45		11/19/45	11/19/45
Switzerland	7/6/45		7/6/45	
Syria	7/6/45			
Turkey	6/6/45	12/20/45	6/6/45	6/6/45 (7)
Union of S. Africa	11/30/45		11/30/45	
United Kingdom	5/31/45 (8)		5/31/45 (8)	
United States	2/8/45	8/9/46	2/8/45 (9)	2/8/45 (9)
Uruguay				
Venezuela	3/28/46		3/28/46	3/28/46
Yugoslavia				
Thai Minister				

A indicates adherence.

* Elected to first Interim Council.

** Elected to first Interim Council by First Interim Assembly June 6, 1946.

The following reservations accompany the acceptances:

(1) "The acceptances are given with the understanding that the provisions of Article IV Section 3 of the International Air Transport Agree-

ment shall become operative in so far as the Government of China is concerned at such time as the Convention on International Civil Aviation . . . shall be ratified by the Government of China." (Chinese instrument of ratification of the Convention on International Civil Aviation deposited Feb. 20, 1946.)

(2) "In accepting this Agreement [transport] in accordance with Article VIII, paragraph two thereof, I am directed to make a reservation with respect to the rights and obligations contained in Article I, Section 1, paragraph (5) of the Agreement, which, under Article IV, Section 1, Greece does not wish, for the time being to grant or receive."

(3) "In signifying their acceptance of these agreements, [interim and transit] the Government of India . . . do not regard Denmark or Thailand as being parties thereto . . .". (Reservation respecting Denmark on interim agreement withdrawn by India July 18, 1946.)

(4) ". . . the signatures . . . affixed to the . . . International Air Transport Agreement (with reservation set forth in Article IV Section 1) constitute an acceptance . . . by the Netherlands Government and an obligation binding upon it." (Reservation relinquished by the Netherlands Sept. 21, 1945.)

(5) ". . . the New Zealand Government does not regard Denmark or Thailand as being parties to the Agreements mentioned [interim and transit] . . .". (Reservation respecting Denmark on interim agreement withdrawn by New Zealand Apr. 29, 1946.)

(6) "The above acceptance is based on the understanding . . . that the provisions of Article II, Section 2 of the International Air Services Transit Agreement shall become operative as to the Commonwealth of the Philippines at such time as the Convention on International Civil Aviation shall be ratified in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the Philippines."

(7) ". . . the reservation made by the Turkish Delegation on the fifth freedom of the air contained in the International Air Transport Agreement is explained in the following article of the law by which the aforementioned instruments have been ratified:

"The Turkish Government, when concluding bilateral agreements, shall have the authority to accept and apply for temporary periods the provision regarding the fifth freedom of the

air contained in the International Air Transport Agreement.'"

(8) "In signifying their acceptance of the said Agreement, [interim and transit] the Government of the United Kingdom . . . neither regard the Governments of Denmark and Siam as being parties thereto . . ." (Reservation respecting Denmark on interim agreement withdrawn by United Kingdom Mar. 30, 1946.)

(9) "These acceptances by the Government of the United States of America are given with the understanding that the provisions of Article II, Section 2, of the International Air Services Transit Agreement and the provisions of Article IV, Section 3, of the International Air Transport Agreement shall become operative as to the United States of America at such time as the Convention on International Civil Aviation . . . shall be ratified by the United States of America". (The United States of America denounced the International Air Transport Agreement July 25, 1946; effective July 25, 1947. The United States of America deposited instrument of ratification of Convention on International Civil Aviation Aug. 9, 1946.)

American Minister to Yemen Presents Credentials

[Released to the press October 4]

J. Rives Childs, first U.S. Minister to Yemen, informed the Department of State on October 4 that he presented his credentials to the Imam Yahya at San'a, capital of Yemen, on the morning of September 30. Minister Childs, who is also U.S. Minister to Saudi Arabia, was accompanied by Harlan B. Clark, Second Secretary of the U.S. Legation at Jidda.

Minister Childs and his party were welcomed by Qadhi Abdul Karim Mutahhar, Acting Foreign Minister, and escorted to the throne room where Minister Childs presented his letter of credence from President Truman and was warmly received by the Imam.

The Imam expressed a desire for American assistance in improving medical conditions in Yemen and has requested that the United States send a medical mission to San'a. The Government of Yemen is also interested in American assistance in developing transportation, irrigation, and agriculture.

Minister Childs and his party will leave San'a

on October 4 for a tour of the more important cities of southern Yemen en route to Aden and then to Jidda, where Minister Childs is permanently stationed.

Request to Brazil for Coffee Imports

[Released to the press September 30]

The Department of State announced on September 30 that a note had been presented to the Brazilian Embassy requesting that the Government of Brazil place 500,000 bags of coffee on the market for United States importers to purchase during the month of October 1946.

The request was made in accordance with paragraph (4) of the "Memorandum of Understanding reached between the Governments of Brazil and the United States of America concerning coffee prices and supplies" dated August 14, 1946. This paragraph reads as follows:

"Should such action be necessary to assure an adequate flow of coffee under this arrangement the Government of Brazil, upon the request of the Government of the United States, will place coffee on the market at the prices provided for in this arrangement up to a total of 3,000,000 bags. The Government of Brazil may be called upon to supply up to 500,000 bags of such coffee per month. The grades of this coffee will range from Santos 2s to Santos 5s, inclusive, the percentage of each grade to approximate the proportion of such grades exported to the United States during 1941 and the cup quality of the coffee to be soft or better."

The note was presented to the Brazilian Embassy at the request of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration, which agencies are responsible for supplies and prices of coffee in this country.

German War Documents

[Released to the press October 3]

A program for the publishing of an authoritative collection of German Foreign Office documents and other official papers is being undertaken by the Department of State. Dr. Raymond J. Sontag of the University of California is director of the project, which was approved by Congress last spring in the State Department's appropriation act.

The objective of the Department is the publication of the complete and accurate documentary

record of German foreign policy preceding and during World War II. It is believed that 20 or more volumes will be required for this task.

In order to guarantee the objectivity of the undertaking, the Department is calling in outside scholars of the highest reputation. There are hundreds of tons of papers of the German Foreign Office and other governmental ministries which will have to be scanned by the staff of editors who will be sent to Germany for this work. It is believed that three years or more will be required for the task.

A photographic project is currently reducing the tons of written material to microfilm. The films are being flown from Germany to the State Department. They began arriving several months ago and are now in the process of being cataloged and translated.

During the past six months the Department has published in the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN and in pamphlet form selected German documents from the large collection of these materials which has been brought over in microfilm. It will continue to do this from time to time. These and future documents published in the BULLETIN will be included in the projected full documentary record.

Treaty Obligations and Philippine Independence

REPLY OF DOMINICAN GOVERNMENT TO U. S. NOTE¹

October 7, 1946

MR. SECRETARY:

I have the honor to refer to Your Excellency's note of the 4th of May of the present year, and to inform Your Excellency, in conformity with instructions that I have received to that effect, that the Dominican Government agrees that the provisions of the Agreement between the United States and the Dominican Republic, effected by an exchange of notes signed the 25th of September 1924, shall not be understood to imply the extension to the Dominican Republic of the advantages accorded by the United States to the Philippines.

Accept, [etc.] EMILIO G. GODOY

His Excellency

DEAN ACHESON,

Acting Secretary of State

¹U.S. note is similar to note sent to Bolivian Government as printed in BULLETIN of June 16, 1946, p. 1049.

Plans for Philippine Rehabilitation

On October 5 a discussion on the plans for Philippine rehabilitation was broadcast over the NBC network. The participants in the broadcast were John Carter Vincent, Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, and Frank P. Lockhart, Chief of the Division of Philippine Affairs, both of the Department of State, and Narcisco Ramos, Chargé d'Affaires of the Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines. This program was one in a series entitled "Our Foreign Policy," presented by the NBC University of the Air. For a complete text of the radio program see Department of State press release 700 of October 4.

Departmental Regulations

116.1 Office of the Legal Adviser (Le): (Effective 9-6-46)

I FUNCTIONS. Those functions of Le pertaining to economic affairs and to treaties shall include:

A Economic Affairs, Le/E.

1 Providing legal services for the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs and for the offices (other than the Office of Foreign Liquidation) under the direction of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, and economic matters otherwise arising in the Department.

B Treaties and Other International Agreements, Le/T.

1 Collecting, compiling, and maintaining information pertaining to treaties and other international agreements.

2 Performing research and furnishing information and advice with respect to the provisions of such existing or proposed instruments.

3 Procedural matters including the preparation of full powers, ratifications, proclamations and protocols.

4 Matters related to the signing of ratifications, proclamations and registration of treaties and other international agreements.

5 Custody of the original text of treaties and other international agreements.

6 Typing and binding of the official (ribbon) copies of treaties, agreements, and so forth prepared in the Department of State.

II ORGANIZATION

A Assistant Legal Adviser for Economical Affairs, Le/E.

Erratum

In the BULLETIN of September 29, 1946, page 574, second column, second paragraph, between the second and third lines read: "agreement reached last May for its association with the United Nations. Under the terms of this".

Contents

General Policy

U. S. Aims and Policies in Europe. By the Secretary of State	665
Statement by the President on the Palestine Situation	669
U. S. Policy in Korea. Statement by Acting Secretary Acheson	670
A New Instrument of U. S. Foreign Policy. By Assistant Secretary Benton	671
Further Protest to Yugoslavia Against Disregard for Allied Military Regulations in Zone A.	676
Letters of Credence: Minister of Rumania. American Minister to Yemen Presents Credentials.	690
Plans for Philippine Rehabilitation	691

The Paris Peace Conference

General Principles for a Free International Danube. Remarks by Senator Vandenberg	656
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

The United Nations

International Traffic on the Danube River:	
Draft Resolution Submitted to Economic and Social Council by U. S. Delegation.	658
Assistance to FAO on Longer-Term International Machinery for Dealing With Food Problems:	
Resolution To Be Proposed by U. S. Delegation.	658
Committee on the Terms of Reference of the Subcommissions of the Economic and Employment Commission: Proposal by U. S. Delegation	659
Summary Statement by the Secretary-General on Matters of Which the Security Council is Seized and of the Stage Reached in Their Consideration.	660

Occupation Matters

U. S. Policy in Korea. Statement by Acting Secretary Acheson	670
Peace: A Challenge to American Leadership. By Assistant Secretary Hill-dring	679

Economic Affairs

The Polish Nationalization Law. Article by Leon Goldenberg and Laure Metzger	651
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Economic Affairs—Continued

Nationalization of Polish Industries	654
U. S. Demonstrations of Radio Aids to Air Navigation.	662
Conference on Tin	663
U. S. Delegation to First Meeting of Preparatory Committee for International Conference on Trade and Employment	664
Discussion of Double Taxation Treaties With Belgium and Luxembourg.	677
Request to Brazil for Coffee Imports.	690

International Information

A New Instrument of U. S. Foreign Policy. By Assistant Secretary Benton	671
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Treaty Information

Soviet Position Concerning Revision of Montreux Convention.	655
Discussion of Double Taxation Treaties With Belgium and Luxembourg.	677
Conclusion of Agreement Providing for Operation of Ocean Weather Stations in North Atlantic.	678
U. S.-Argentine Negotiations on Air Transport Agreement Suspended.	682
Tax Treaty With the Netherlands.	687
Status of Civil Aviation Documents Formulated at Chicago, December 7, 1944.	688
Request to Brazil for Coffee Imports	690
Treaty Obligations and Philippine Independence. Reply of Dominican Government to U. S. Note	691

International Organizations and Conferences

Calendar of Meetings	661
--------------------------------	-----

Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation

Second Pan American Conference on Leprosy	664
Visit of Argentine Psychologist.	682
U. S. National Commission for United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization:	
Transmittal of Final Report by Assistant Secretary Benton to the Secretary of State	683
Report of U. S. National Commission to the Secretary of State	684

The Department

Publications: German War Documents	690
Departmental Regulations	691